p
-2
3-1894
6567

GENEALOGY COLLECTION

3 1833 01178 1876

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/huguenotsocietyo00hugu

VOL. 1. NO. 1.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Huguenot Society of America.

Vol. 1-2
1882-1894

MAY 29TH, 1883, TO JUNE 2ND, 1884.



Printed for the Society by authority of the Executive Committee.
NEW YORK, 1884.

53090
11736
THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY

1546567

THE
Huguenot Society of America.

ABSTRACT OF PROCEEDINGS, NUMBER ONE.

PRINTED FOR THE SOCIETY
BY AUTHORITY OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
NEW YORK CITY.

(Original edition, 1884.
Reprinted, December, 1899.)

THE
MCMASTER
UNIVERSITY

The French Protestant Church (Huguenot) of Charleston, S. C.

Founded A. D. 1681–82. Believed to be the fourth successive Church upon this site.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

SHORTLY after the issue of this pamphlet, Mr. Bartow, the Treasurer of the Society, who had gotten it up, was found dead in his room. By some mishap the copies undistributed, doubtless the larger part of the edition, disappeared. The great rarity of the pamphlet and its exceptional value as the account of the early days of the Society, written by one who was an eye-witness from the beginning, induced the Executive Committee to authorize a reprint. This has been made as far as possible a facsimile in type and general appearance ; but the few errors of the pen or typography have been corrected, the seal does not appear on the title-page or cover, the woodcut of the Huguenot Church of Charleston has been replaced by a half-tone from the volume commemorative of the issue of the Edict of Nantes, and the account of the Bartow family written by Mr. Bartow upon the back fly-leaves of his copy of the second volume of Bolton's *History of the County of Westchester*, is added. The original pamphlet is two pages longer in this reprint, necessitating the insertion of figures in brackets under "Contents."

THE PUBLICATION COMMITTEE.

December 15, 1899.

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF THE BARTOW FAMILY

By

MOREY HALE BARTOW.

THE Rev. John Bartow was born before his father, Thomas Bartow, M.D., removed to Credition, Eng., and he died in 1726. The coat of arms hereditary in the "Bartow of West Chester" family, mentioned on page 350 of the second volume of Bolton's *History of Westchester County*, is officially given in Tome I. of the *Armorial Universel*, by J. D'Eschavannes, as those of "Bertaut en Bretagne," of France. Anthony Bartow, son of the Rev. John Bartow, who died in 1790, had these arms, as did several members of the family in the last century. The Rev. Robert Bolton, author of the history mentioned above, in a letter to the Rev. Evelyn Bartow, states that some of the old papers and documents of my grandfather, Basil John Bartow, which were inherited by him, bore wax seals having the same arms as the family in France, and I have an old watch seal with the arms beautifully engraved or cut thereon. In the Johnston family, descended from a brother of my grandfather Bartow, who was a wholesale merchant of New York City until the War of 1812, is a photograph of the arms taken from a wax seal. John Bartow, son of the Rev. John Bartow, was educated a lawyer. He was Surrogate of the County of West Chester, New York, from 1754 to 1761, and for many years Clerk of West Chester County; he was also a merchant. His watch (probably his father's watch before him) is in the possession of Mr. William A. Duncan, of this city, the eldest grandson of Clarina Bartow. John Bartow left a brief written autobiography of himself, in which he described his parents and some of the incidents of the War of the Revolution. At its close he was one of the first to petition and secure from the Legislature of the State of New York a charter for St. Peter's Church, at West Chester, N. Y. (founded by his father in 1702), as he had previously aided in securing a royal charter in 1762. See pages 368 and 390 of Bolton's second volume. John Bartow was a devoted Christian, and died unmarried, in 1802. It was through him that the ancestral history of the family was perpetuated. He and my great-grandfather, Basil Bartow, lived with their mother, Helena Bartow, at the Homestead. "Old Uncle John," as he was called, told his niece Mary, the third daughter of his brother, Anthony Bartow, who married John Reid, of East Chester, N. Y., and also the grandmother of the Rev. Evelyn Bartow, and other members of his family, of their being of Huguenot origin, and that the name of the family in France was Bertaut, and that they came from Brittany. My cousins, Mary, Frances, and Eliza Ann

Bartow, daughters of Anthony A. Bartow, and granddaughters of the Rev. Theodosius Bartow (who was a grandson of the Rev. John Bartow, who came from England in 1702), told me of the account their father gave of our ancestors having fled from France into Holland, and coming from thence into England; and the name of Bertaut is given in Webster's "Unabridged Dictionary," on page 1712, in connection with that of Jean Bertaut, French Bishop of Seez and poet (1552–1611), as having the pronunciation of bĕr-tō, which is very nearly the same pronunciation as the name now has written in English as Bartow. The family went from Holland to Exeter, England, and Peter Bartow, a grandson of the refugee from France, was living at Awliscombe at the outset of the struggle between Charles I. and Oliver Cromwell, and he took up arms against the Parliament, for which he was heavily fined and pardoned by the joint action of the House of Lords and House of Commons (as may be seen in the printed volume of their Proceedings) after the execution of Charles I. Doctor Thomas Bartow, son of Peter Bartow, is put down on the Church Records of the Church of the Holy Cross as "Magister" as well as "Doctor," and he was a man of considerable importance. He and his wife, Grace Bartow, are buried in the churchyard of the Holy Cross, at Credition, near Exeter, England. The Rev. John Bartow, their eldest son, was a graduate of Christ College, Cambridge, and was then Vicar of the Parish Church at Pampisford, Cambridgeshire, England, until he was recommended by his Bishop, Symon Patrick of Ely, as eminently fitted to become a missionary, and was sent as such to America, as described in Bolton. He married Helena, the second daughter of the Hon. John Reid and Margaret Miller, his wife. The Hon. John Reid was Surveyor-General of the Province of New Jersey, and a member of the Provincial Legislature. He brought over a party of emigrants from Scotland, and he was the agent of the Lords Proprietors of New Jersey, and was a prominent man. Five of the Rev. John Bartow's descendants became Episcopal clergymen as follows: The Rev. Theodosius Bartow, of New Rochelle, N. Y.; Rev. John Vanderbilt Bartow, of Trinity Church, Baltimore, Md.; Rev. Theodore B. Bartow, of Georgia, afterwards Chaplain in the U. S. Navy; Rev. Henry B. Bartow, brother of the Rev. Theodore; and the Rev. Evelyn Bartow, the youngest son of the late Edgar John Bartow, who was the founder of the Church of the Holy Trinity in Brooklyn, N. Y., and built the entire structure, save the completion of the upper portion of the spire, from his private fortune and with $75,000 that was given by his wife. He also built the first house with a stone front in Brooklyn, and built at his own expense the stone arches that span the street leading up the hill from the Wall Street Ferry to New York, from which the view is obtained from Brooklyn Heights; and he declined the nomination of the Democratic party to become Mayor of Brooklyn. The following descendants of the Rev. John Bartow married Episcopal clergymen: Emeline J. Bartow married the Rev. Dr. Wm. H. Lewis; Susan R., her sister, married

the Rev. Wm. A. Curtis ; Frances L. Bartow married the Rev. George A. Shelton, of Newtown, L. I., and her sister Charlotte L. married the Rev. F. Clements. My great-grandfather, Basil Bartow, married Clarina, daughter of Rev. Ebenezer Punderson of Rye, N. Y., an Episcopal clergyman mentioned in Bolton. Their youngest son, Basil John Bartow, my grandfather, married Elizabeth Ann, daughter of Captain Israel Honeywell, an officer in the War of the Revolution. Their eldest son, Captain Aquila Bartow, my father, married Martha Ann Waring, the only daughter of William Waring and Phebe Scribner, his wife. I am the eldest child, and since the death of my infant sister Elizie Ann, the only child of my parents. New Albany, Floyd County, Ia., was founded and owned by the Scribners, and I was born there. The Bartows and the Scribners were devout Christians ; the latter were Presbyterians. Dr. Theodosius Bartow of Savannah, Ga., had two daughters, Theodosia, who married the Rev. Dr. E. E. Ford of Georgia, and Wilhelmina, who married the Rev. H. K. Rees of Georgia,—both Episcopal clergymen.

THE
Huguenot Society of America.

ABSTRACT OF PROCEEDINGS, NUMBER ONE.

CONTENTS.

I.—Introduction, giving an account of the origin and formation of The Huguenot Society of America. Pages 3–5.

II.—The First Public Meeting of the Society in the French Church du Saint Esprit, New York, with the Introductory Remarks of the President, Hon. John Jay; A brief notice of the Discourse delivered by the Rt. Rev. John Todd Quintard, Bishop of Tennessee; Remarks of Assistant Bishop Henry C. Potter, of New York; "Some Traits of Huguenot Character," a Paper read by Professor Henry M. Baird, D.D., LL.D., Author of "The Rise of the Huguenots of France"; Closing Address by the Rev. Thomas E. Vermilye, D.D., LL.D., of the Collegiate (Dutch) Church, New York. Pages 5–20.

III.—Proceedings of the Anniversary Meeting; The Treasurer's Report; Names of New Members; Election of Officers for 1884–85. Pages 20–22.

IV.—The Second Public Meeting of the Society in the Collegiate (Dutch) Church, Cor. of Fifth Avenue and Forty-eighth Street, New York; Address of Welcome, by the Rev. Talbot W. Chambers, D.D.; "The Mingling of the Huguenots and Dutch in Early New York," a Paper read by the Rev. A. G. Vermilye, D.D.; "The Huguenots of South Carolina and their Churches," a Paper read by the Rev. Charles S. Vedder, D.D., Pastor of the French Protestant Church of Charleston, S. C. Pages 32–49.

V.—Miscellaneous Information.—The Publication Fund of the Society; The Official Arms and Seal of the Huguenot Society of America; A Huguenot Library; The names of the Huguenot Refugees who Emigrated to South Carolina, collected by the late Thomas Gaillard, Esq., of Alabama, formerly of Charleston, S. C.; The "South Carolina Society" of Charleston, of Huguenot origin; The Rev. Dr. Charles W. Baird's forthcoming book, "History of the Emigration of the Huguenots to America, and of their Settlement in the French Possessions and New England"; "An Appeal for France," by the American and Foreign Christian Union. Pages 49–56.

PRINTED FOR THE SOCIETY

BY AUTHORITY OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,

NEW YORK CITY.

OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY.

The Huguenot Society of America has for its object:

First.—To perpetuate the memory and to foster and promote the principles and virtues of the Huguenots.

Secondly.—To publicly commemorate at stated times the principal events in the history of the Huguenots.

Thirdly.—To discover, collect, and preserve all still existing documents, monuments, etc., relating to the genealogy or history of the Huguenots of America in general.

Fourthly.—To gather by degrees a library, for the use of the Society, composed of all obtainable books, monographs, pamphlets, manuscripts, etc., relating to the Huguenots.

Fifthly.—To cause statedly to be prepared and read before the Society, papers, essays, etc., on obscure or disputed questions in Huguenot history or genealogy.

Sixthly.—To cause to be prepared and published, when the requisite materials have been discovered and procured, collections for a memorial history of the Huguenots in America, wherein shall be particularly set forth the part belonging to that element in the growth and development of American character, institutions, and progress.

Seventhly.—To establish branches of this Society in other American cities, and to encourage the foundation of similar Societies in other countries, where Huguenots have taken refuge, in order to arrive, with their aid, at a correct estimate of the combined influence of the Huguenots upon the history of the world at large.

To realize this laudable purpose, three things are particularly desirable:

First.—That every Huguenot family in America should at once be represented by at least one of its members in the new Society. This would give the Society a really national character, and would enable it from the outset to take rank with the most important societies in this or any other country.

Secondly.—That each member of this Society should carefully compose, for the use of the Society, a genealogy or history of the family which he represents; to make exact copies of all important papers in the possession of his family, and to commit to writing such facts as he may know in regard to the history of other Huguenot families. All these contributions would be placed in the archives of the Society, and would serve as most valuable materials for a general history of the Huguenots in America.

Thirdly.—That the nucleus of a library, "composed of all obtainable books, monographs, pamphlets, manuscripts, etc., relating to the Huguenots," should be formed without delay. In this matter the Society must largely depend upon the generosity of its members and friends, who are earnestly invited to donate to the Society any book, pamphlet, or manuscript of interest treating of Huguenot genealogy or history.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE YEAR 1884-85.

HON. JOHN JAY,	*President, New York City.*
EDWARD F. DE LANCEY, ESQ.,	*Vice-President for New York.*
HON. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW,	*Vice-President for Staten Island.*
REV. EPHRAIM DE PUY,	*Vice-President for New Paltz.*
HON. ROBERT C. WINTHROP,	*Vice-President for Boston.*
CHARLES M. DU PUY, ESQ.,	*Vice-President for Pennsylvania.*
*REV. A. V. WITTMEYER,	*Secretary, New York City.*
MOREY HALE BARTOW, ESQ.,	*Treasurer, New York City.*

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

HON. JOHN JAY, *ex officio*, CHAIRMAN.

EDWARD F. DE LANCEY, ESQ., *ex officio.*
REV. A. V. WITTMEYER, *ex officio.*
MOREY HALE BARTOW, ESQ., *ex officio.*
REV. B. F. DE COSTA, D.D.
JOSIAH H. GAUTIER, M.D.
P. W. GALLAUDET, ESQ.
HON. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW.
FREDERIC J. DE PEYSTER, ESQ.

* All communications in regard to the Society should be addressed to the Secretary, Rev. A. V. Wittmeyer, No. 232 West 21st Street, New York City.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Huguenot Society of America owes its origin to the initiative taken by the Rev. Alfred V. Wittmeyer, Rector of the French Church du Saint Esprit, No. 30 West Twenty-second Street, New York City, to gather the facts relating to the descendants of the Huguenots in America, with a view of arranging for a commemoration of the bi-centennial of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, on the 22d of October, 1885. The first public notice of such intention was given in an article published in the *Evening Telegram* of February 2, 1883, in which an historical outline was given of the Old French Church in New York City, and mention was made of the remains of the early Huguenots reinterred in the vault owned by the French church in the graveyard of the Protestant Episcopal church of "St. Mark's in the Bowery," corner of Stuyvesant Street and Second Avenue.

On Thursday evening, March 6, 1883, the Rev. Alfred V. Wittmeyer read a paper before the New York Historical Society on the "History of the Huguenot Church of New York." At its conclusion, the question was asked, "Why not organize a society of the Huguenot descendants in the city of New York?" It was stated, in the discussion that followed the reading of the Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer's paper, that the present seemed peculiarly favorable for such an organization, and that the Honorable John Jay, the grandson of Chief-Justice John Jay, of Revolutionary fame, and of a Huguenot family of La Guienne, and himself the late American Minister at the Court of Austria, should be asked to serve as the President of such Society. The Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer, a native of the Saar-Union, France, of which his father and grandfathers were mayors, and whose education was acquired chiefly in France, afterwards graduating from the Union Theological Seminary of New York, and then becoming Chaplain of St. Luke's Hospital, and editor of the *Church Journal*, prior to becoming Rector of the Église du St. Esprit, was suggested as a proper Secretary of such Society.

A preliminary meeting of a few gentlemen with this object in view was accordingly held at the residence of the Hon. John Jay, in the city of New York, on April 12, 1883, at which the Rev. Ephraim de Puy was elected Chairman, and the Rev. A. V. Wittmeyer, Secretary. Letters from the Hon. Abram Hewitt, Member of Congress from New York, the Rev. Thomas E. Vermilye, D.D., of the Collegiate (Dutch) Church, of New York, and others, warmly commending the object of the meeting, were then read; and after an address by the Hon. John Jay, on the eminent propriety of organizing a Huguenot Society, the Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer read a paper briefly setting forth the object, conditions of membership, etc., of the proposed Society. A Special Committee, consisting of Edward F. de

Lancey, Esq., the Rev. Dr. B. F. De Costa, and the Rev. A. V. Wittmeyer, was then appointed to prepare a circular in relation to the proposed Society, which was sent to all persons within convenient distance who were known to be of Huguenot origin, with a subsequent invitation, by postal card, to attend a public meeting to be held in the Hall of the New York Historical Society's building, No. 170 Second Avenue, on Tuesday, at noon, May 29, 1883.

In response to this invitation, quite a number of the descendants of Huguenot families, including ladies (one of whom came a long distance by rail especially to attend the meeting), were present. At this meeting, Edward F. de Lancey, Esq., was elected Chairman, and the Rev. A. V. Wittmeyer, Secretary.

The draft of a Constitution and By-Laws, prepared by the Rev. Alfred V. Wittmeyer and Morey Hale Bartow, Esq., was then read, and after slight modifications, adopted, which is the one now in force. An incident of this meeting was the recognition of perfect equality between male and female members in the use of the ballot, and the eligibility of females for membership, the same being definitely fixed by Article III., Section 1, of the Constitution of the Society, which is here inserted.

ARTICLE III.

MEMBERSHIP.

SEC. 1. The membership of the Society shall be as follows:

First, All descendants in the direct male lines of the Huguenot families which emigrated to America prior to the promulgation of the Edict of Toleration, November 28, 1787.

Secondly, All descendants through the female lines of the Huguenot families which emigrated to America prior to the promulgation of the Edict of Toleration, November 28, 1787.

Thirdly, Representatives of other French families whose profession of the Protestant Faith is anterior to the promulgation of the Edict of Toleration, November 28, 1787.

Fourthly, Writers who have made the history, genealogy, principles, etc., of the Huguenots a special subject of study and research, to whatever nationality they may belong.

In consonance with this action, ladies are entitled to be present at all meetings of the Society of every kind, and at the Annual Dinners.

After the adoption of the Constitution and By-Laws, the following gentlemen were unanimously elected as officers of the Society, to serve until the next Anniversary Meeting: President, the Hon. John Jay; Vice-President for New York City, Edward F. de Lancey, Esq.; Secretary, the Rev. Alfred V. Wittmeyer; and Treasurer, Morey Hale Bartow, Esq.

The article of the Constitution not adopted at the organization meeting was referred to a committee for reconsideration. As it is an important part of the Constitution, it is reproduced here as amended by the special committee :

ARTICLE V.

MEETINGS.

This Society shall hold three regular meetings each year, and in accordance with the purpose of the Society, the said meetings shall take place on the following historical dates :

SEC. 1. The Anniversary Meetings shall be held on April 13th, the day of the Promulgation of the Edict of Nantes, granting Freedom of Worship to the Huguenots of France.

SEC. 2. The Summer Meeting of the Society shall be held on the 24th of August, the date of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, in some place outside of the city of New York.

SEC. 3. The Autumn Meeting of the Society shall be held on the 22d of October, the date of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

SEC. 4. The Executive Committee shall have power to arrange for a dinner annually at such a time as they may deem most appropriate.

SEC. 5. In case any of these dates fall upon a day inconvenient for the proper celebration thereof, the Executive Committee shall appoint for the meeting the next most convenient day.

THE FIRST PUBLIC MEETING.

A large and cultured audience, which filled the beautiful French Church du Saint Esprit, assembled on Thursday evening, November 15, 1883, at eight o'clock, to do honor to the first public meeting of the Society. The President, the Hon. John Jay, presided on the occasion. After appropriate religious exercises, conducted in the French language by the Secretary of the Society, who is the Rector of the Church, President Jay made the following introductory remarks :

HON. JOHN JAY'S REMARKS.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN : I beg you to accept our thanks for your presence at this first public meeting of the Huguenot Society of America. However much may be regretted the lateness of its appearance among the national societies that do honor to New York, the cordial welcome which has hailed its birth seems to show a ready appreciation of the fitness of the American descendants of the Huguenots uniting to attempt at least the accomplishment of the objects proposed by this Society.

It is intended to perpetuate their memory, to discover and preserve

still-existing documents that may illustrate their annals; to collect books, monographs, pamphlets, memoirs, family papers, and MSS., relating to the Huguenots; to cause papers to be prepared on obscure or disputed questions, and to publish collections that may serve for a memorial history exhibiting the part belonging to the Huguenot element in the growth and development of American character, institutions, and progress.

Among the first volumes which they hope to publish will probably be the original records of the venerable Church of the St. Esprit from the year 1686, the year succeeding the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The records, I understand, are complete and without a break, and, apart from their historic value, they will have a personal interest for thousands of our citizens here and throughout the country who in direct or collateral lines trace their descent from the Huguenots whose births, marriages, and deaths are here recorded. The Huguenots of New Netherland as early as 1638 constituted so large and substantial a portion of the population that De la Montagne was associated in the government with Kieft, and the public documents were printed equally in French and Dutch.

A further plan proposed by the Society is the establishment of branches in other States, and the encouragement of similar societies in other countries where the Huguenots have taken refuge, in order to arrive by their aid at a more correct estimate of the combined influence of the Huguenots upon the history of the world at large.

While this, if accomplished, will be a work of time and labor, the recognized respectability of the Huguenot element forbids its being pronounced impossible. Southey has said, "Wherever the refugees from the French persecution fled, a blessing followed them"; wherever they found a refuge they amply repaid the generous hospitality with which they were received by their public usefulness, their intelligence, skill, and industry. The virtues, the accomplishments, and the arts which France lost by the banishment of its most conservative element, compelled by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes,—a loss so terribly avenged a century later, by the horrors of the French Revolution,—brought the blessings which France rejected to the nations who received her exiles.

In England, the Huguenot regiment and cavalry commanded by the brave old Marshal Schönberg, composed of veterans and, in great part, of officers and gentlemen, won for William of Orange the battle of the Boyne, against soldiers under the banner of James II. and Louis XIV., some of whom wore in their hats the white cross which had marked the assassins of the Huguenots on St. Bartholomew's eve. From that great event in English history dates the establishment on a firm basis of the unity, strength, and world-wide dominion of the British Empire.

To the early Huguenots of New York an eloquent tribute was paid by the Rev. Dr. Storrs in his memorable address on "The Early American Spirit," before the Historical Society, in 1875. After speaking of the Dutch and English in New York, he said:

"To these two elements was added a vivid and graceful force by those who came from the fruitful Protestant Provinces of France. . . . The Huguenot movement had begun in France, not among the poorer people, but in the Capital and in the University. The revival of letters had given it primary impulse. . . . Its ministers were among the most learned and eloquent in that country and century of eloquent preachers. It had counted distinguished nobles in its ranks; Condé and Coligni among its leaders. Marguerite, Queen of Navarre, had been in her time the centre of it. It was intimately connected with the high politics of the realm. . . . The commerce of the kingdom, and its finest manufactures, were largely in the hands of those who composed the eight hundred Huguenot churches found in France in the early part of the seventeenth century.

"The families of this descent who were early in New York—some of them as early as 1625—and who were afterward in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Virginia, South Carolina, brought with them thus an ancestral influence of education, refinement, and skilful enterprise as well as of religious fidelity.

"The French vivacity blended in them with a quiet and careful sense of duty. They brought new arts and graceful industries; a certain chivalric and cultivated tone; while the right to freedom in the worship of God and in the conduct of civil affairs was as dear to them as to any of those whose fortunes they shared. This spirit had compelled respect in the land which they left from those who hated it most intensely. For nearly ninety years it had made it indispensable to maintain there the edict which secured to them their religious rights. . . . Such an element of population was powerful here beyond its numbers. Its trained vitality made it efficient." And after some slight recapitulation of their part in American politics, Dr. Storrs added, "Whenever the history of those who came hither from La Rochelle and the banks of the Garonne is fully written, the value and the vigor of the force which they imparted to the early American public life will need no demonstration."

To preserve and perpetuate the evidences of that history is one of the chief objects of the Huguenot Society in America. [Applause.]

BISHOP QUINTARD'S DISCOURSE.

President Jay then introduced the Rt. Rev. John Todd Quintard, Bishop of Tennessee, who delivered an interesting discourse. He began by giving a brief account of the great Reformation in Europe in the sixteenth century, in which he paid a glowing tribute to Martin Luther. France, he said, was the first country where the new doctrines of the Reformation were taught, and the last where these doctrines produced political strife. He then traced the course of the Huguenot persecution in France down to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, and said that four hundred thousand Huguenots left France in the twenty

years preceding the Revocation, and six hundred thousand more left in the twenty years succeeding it. Most of these refugees were citizens of consideration. Among them were mechanics and artisans of every description, and it was truly said the Huguenots had carried commerce with them. Large numbers of them settled in Massachusetts, in New York, and in South Carolina. During the reading of his discourse, Bishop Quintard held up before the audience a restrike of the celebrated medal that was struck originally in 1572, at Rome, under Pope Gregory XIII., to commemorate the Massacre of St. Bartholomew in France. At the conclusion of the discourse, Rossini's terzetto, "Accorde-nous tes faveurs, O Dieu," was sung by the double-quartette choir.

BISHOP POTTER'S REMARKS.

The next speaker was the then just chosen Assistant Episcopal Bishop of New York, the Rt. Rev. Henry C. Potter, late the eloquent and beloved Rector of Grace Church. He was welcomed and introduced by his friend, the honored President of the Society, in terms of peculiar warmth and fitness.

Coming forward, Bishop Potter spoke as follows :

I am in no sense here to deliver a formal address, but have merely come to express my congratulations and rejoice with you upon the organization of such a Society as this of yours. In these later times we want to be reminded of things unseen yet eternal ; of heroism, which, though unseen, never dies ; of courage and virtue, which are not only an element of power in a community, but add a dignity to any name. That is the reason I am thankful such an association as this has been called into existence. It is a curious anomaly, by the way, that in a republic so altogether republican as this of ours, a republic so eager to forget those distinctions of rank and lineage held in esteem in older communities, and to make little of them ; yet the New Englanders and the Hollanders, the French, the Irish, and the Germans, are all ever glad to go back on the trail of the past, and are rejoiced to be able to remind themselves of the honored names among their race, and to trace the lines their own name has come down—or shall I say come up ? This must supremely be a privilege of the members of this Society, for who can boast of his ancestry as can the Huguenot ? There are, we have been told, three strains in our State—Puritan, Dutch, and Huguenot. In the early history of the State we find they were all distinguished, but the last more especially for a lofty and austere morality, for the largest charity, and for the finest manners. Can there be more distinguished characteristics ? The Secretary of your Society, when he came to ask me to attend this meeting, tried to make me believe that my own ancestry must have been Huguenot. I tried very hard to see it myself, but I could n't do it. My ancestors, unfortunately, were Quakers, and I am by descent a Puritan. Now,

though the Puritans were distinguished by a lofty and austere morality, and, perhaps, for a large charity, it is undeniably rather to the Huguenots than the Puritans that the finest manners belong; certainly they cannot be proud of that kind of fine manners which drove my ancestors from Massachusetts to Rhode Island. [Laughter and applause.] And they paid dearly for their lack of manners too, for there is no doubt but that if the former State had been settled by Huguenots instead of Puritans, their roots would be there unto this day. [Applause.]

I need hardly ask you if you are not all familiar with that noble picture of the English painter Millais,—that picture in which the Huguenot lover and his Catholic betrothed are standing in a last fond embrace upon the eve of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew. She is trying to bind upon his arm the white handkerchief which on the morrow shall mark him as to be spared from the slaughter. He, with his arm about his loved one, is gently loosening her fingers from the knot. Can you ever forget, when you have once seen it, that expression so tender, so gentle, but so courageous and unyielding, which denotes that he will not save his life unless he can save his honor too? Remember that grand old motto, "noblesse oblige," which sums up in two words all that is high and noble in conduct. Remember the claims upon you, to be held in honored memory, of those forefathers who held on to the faith God revealed to them in their closets and on their knees, who for that faith braved death and exile, and, leaving their own dear land, went forth among strangers. Cherish the memory of them and of their virtues, and, above all, remember that "noblesse oblige." [Great applause.]

In referring to the next speaker, the President especially congratulated the Society on the presence of one who, from his long and patient research, had a right to speak with authority on all matters pertaining to the annals of the Huguenots. It gave him peculiar gratification to introduce the widely esteemed author of the "Rise of the Huguenots of France," Professor Henry M. Baird.

Acknowledging the courtesy of the Chair, Dr. Baird read the following paper:

SOME TRAITS OF HUGUENOT CHARACTER.

By Professor Henry M. Baird, D.D., LL.D., of the University of the City of New York.

Not far from three and a quarter centuries ago—on the 13th of December, 1560—that eminent patriot, Michel de l'Hospital, in his opening speech at the meeting of the States-General held in the city of Orleans, used this expression: "Let us do away with those diabolical words, names of parties, factions, and seditions—'Lutherans,' 'Huguenots,' and 'Papists'—and let us retain only the name of 'Christians.'"

The "diabolical" name of "Huguenot," which the learned Chancellor of France wished so summarily to consign to oblivion, had come into general

currency only during the year near whose close he was speaking. It first appears in history in connection with the "Tumult of Amboise." But whence it had its origin, what was its particular meaning, what were the special circumstances that gave it birth—these are questions by no means easy to be answered. Of one thing, however, we may rest assured,—it was an enemy that invented the nickname; it was in the spirit of malevolence that it was applied to the adherents of a religious party everywhere spoken against. It matters little, therefore, which one of a dozen derivations is correct, or if any one is correct. It concerns us not at all whether the Huguenots were so called because their superstitious neighbors, when they saw them flitting by night to the conventicles which bloody persecution would not permit them to hold by day, mistook them for the hobgoblin with which good mothers at Tours used to frighten their disobedient children into subjection and the keeping of early hours—I mean the phantom known as "Le Roy Huguon," or "Huguet." Or, whether the term was an imported word, a corruption of the "Eidgenossen" of Geneva. Or, whether they were right that asserted that "Huguenot" was a word, in a certain patois of France, signifying a copper coin of the smallest denomination; and that the early Protestants were contemptuously called Huguenots on the ground that they were so worthless as scarcely to pass for a farthing.

The one point of real interest is that, whatever the true etymology may be, "Huguenot" was a term of reproach; to use Chancellor L'Hospital's language, it was a "diabolical" nickname, a word provocative of sedition, which every true patriot wished to have stricken out of the French tongue.

I cannot say at what precise time the unfriendly associations of the word ceased; in the mouths of Roman Catholic opponents, and on the lips of the rabble, perhaps never until the era of religious liberty dawned, just before the outbreak of the first French Revolution. But long before that time, I find that the Protestants of France had accepted the name forced upon them by their enemies—much as the early witnesses of our faith first at Antioch began to adopt the designation of "Christians." Accordingly, in a letter of King Henry of Navarre, dated the 24th of July, 1580,—or just about a score of years after Chancellor L'Hospital's denunciation of the word as "diabolical,"—it occurs in a complimentary sense. The Protestant leader here speaks to his correspondent of M. de Caussade as one "qui m'est fort affectionné serviteur et ancien *huguenot*"—"a very devoted servant of mine and *an old Huguenot*."

Time works great changes, indeed. It obliterates old landmarks. With its soft touch it imperceptibly removes much that once was harsh in language, as in thought and opinion. It is not impossible that there may be some even of this cultivated audience that have never before realized that the word "Huguenot" was in its origin a word of reproach. And certainly none here present will dispute the assertion that, in founding a

Huguenot Society of America, you, Mr. President, and the gentlemen associated with you, were very far from endorsing the opinion of even so illustrious a jurist as the High Chancellor of France, and regarding "Huguenot" as a diabolic and seditious word.

How, then, it may well be asked, has the revolution been effected? What cause has been potent enough to transform a term of obloquy into an appellation so honorable that those of us are justly proud that can trace our ancestry back to the once persecuted Huguenots of France?

The answer to this question must be found in the men themselves that bore the name—men who, by their virtues, invested it with a glory in the brilliancy of whose rays the original opprobriousness of the nickname is effectually lost. To a few traits of the Huguenot character, as it was developed in France during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, I shall confine myself during the few minutes of your time that I shall occupy.

1. The Huguenots of France were, first of all, men of high moral and religious principle. If the Protestant party ever assumed a political character, it was no fault of its own. The name of "Huguenots" is only another designation for the adherents of the Reformed Church of France. From the time of the first spread of the doctrines of the Reformation at Meaux, which may be approximately set down at the year 1521, down to the year 1560, its votaries had generally been styled "Lutherans" or "Christaudins." But from the latter date, for over two centuries, or down to the publication of the "Edict of Toleration" by Louis the Sixteenth, in 1787, the Protestants of France were known almost indifferently as "Huguenots," or as "ceux de la religion," or as "religionnaires." It was in the name of religion that all the sufferings to which the Huguenots were subjected were endured; it was in defence of their faith that the sword was grasped so often as the resort to war was forced upon them. But the religion for which such sublime patience was displayed and such heroic achievements were performed was no cold formula of belief, but an active principle of life. The Huguenot had not merely a purer creed, but a higher standard of morals, than the rest of the community in which he lived. Combining superior industry with exemplary simplicity and purity of conduct in all the relations of social intercourse, the Huguenot was no less distinguished for his virtues than for his superior thrift and growing material prosperity. You could, indeed, tell the Huguenot artisan from his Roman Catholic neighbor by the circumstance that, in consequence of his greater devotion to his trade, he, every year, gained sensibly upon him in wealth; by the circumstance that the Huguenot faithfully worked six days in the week and as faithfully rested on the day of God's appointment, while his fellow of the Roman Catholic belief took twice as many days of repose. The consequence of which, according to fixed and inexorable economic laws, was that the workman whose industrial year was of 310 days, found himself perceptibly richer at its close than the workman whose

year—saint's days excluded—counted up only 260 days of honest toil. I repeat it, that the Huguenot artisan could readily be distinguished by his superior assiduity and success; but he was even more easily recognized by the traits of his moral character. To their honor be it said, that the Huguenots alienated a licentious court by nothing so much as by their adherence to a lofty code of personal purity. Honesty in commercial dealings, truthfulness, abstinence from profane and loose conversation were pretty sure marks by which to tell them from others. Their very enemies gave unconscious testimony to their excellence; for it went very hard indeed with an unfortunate adherent of the established church, when accidentally mistaken for a Huguenot, if he could not triumphantly establish his unimpeachable orthodoxy by the utterance of some good round oath. "The Huguenot," it was said, "never swears."

Nor was freedom from profanity the only point in which their enemies unwittingly conceded to the Huguenots that, to use the famous expression of Louis the Twelfth, respecting the Waldenses, or Vaudois, of Provence, "they are better Christians than we are." It was notably so with regard to litigation. In their church courts and otherwise, by friendly arbitration, the Huguenots were accustomed to settle many, if not most, of the disputes arising between members of their own communion. In the discussions of Parliament in June to July, 1561, in which the so-called "Edict of July" was matured, the Bishop of Paris had the temerity to allege this fact to their disadvantage. It was evidence, he said, of the impudence of the Reformers that they thus interfered with the prerogatives of the royal courts! To which the same great legal authority to whom reference has been made—Chancellor L'Hospital—promptly replied by saying that he marvelled at the impudence and malice of those who blamed men for settling their disputes and controversies among friends. "As if," said he, with pardonable contempt for his reverend objector, "as if the whole system of law had not been enacted, and forms of trial had not been instituted, for the very purpose that men at variance with one another might be brought into concord and induced to live lovingly together! Whoever he be that brings this result to pass deserves reward and not punishment."

2. It was scarcely less by their devotion to the cause of education and the spread of knowledge that the Huguenots invested with glory the name at first derisively applied to them. From the very beginning, religion and popular elevation by means of the school and college went hand in hand. The Huguenots held no such doctrine as that "ignorance is the mother of devotion." On the contrary, believing, with Socrates, in the perfect consistency of all truth, they unhesitatingly brought their teachings into the blazing light of day, and felt no manner of solicitude lest any conflict might arise between the science of nature and the science of religion. All they wanted was that men should investigate. They were themselves the men of enlightened views in the community. You will, perhaps, remember the little incident so well told by our own Motley, how that, at one time, at the

table of the Prince of Orange, the Seigneur de Montigny asked a knight newly come from Burgundy, whether there were many Huguenots in that province. "No," replied the knight, "nor would they be permitted to exist there." "If that be so," rejoined Montigny, "there can be very few persons of intelligence in Burgundy, for those who have any wit are mostly all Huguenots." It was natural, then, that the Huguenots should be the earnest friends of education. And, in point of fact, we find that there was no trial so great, no persecution so bloody, but that in the very midst of it the Huguenot was devising measures for multiplying the facilities, for extending the usefulness, of the schools which he had established. The subject was one dear to his heart. It occupied his attention, whether he sat in the ecclesiastical councils that from time to time assembled to deliberate respecting the interests of his faith, or in those other convocations of a more worldly nature where he took measures of self-defence against relentless foes that sought his life. In the second States-General of Blois, sitting during the last months of the year 1588, the utter annihilation of Protestantism in France had been formally decreed; the act had been solemnly confirmed by all three Orders of the kingdom; it had been sworn to by Henry the Third upon the consecrated wafer he was about to take; the oath had been assumed by noblesse, clergy, and tiers état with hands uplifted to heaven. Yet, at that very time, a National Assembly of the proscribed Huguenots, meeting in the city of La Rochelle, under the presidency of a "Protector" who, though the nearest heir to the throne, had by his fanatical enemies been pronounced incapable of the succession.—I say, a Huguenot National Assembly, meeting under such circumstances, in very peril of their existence, found opportunity and inclination to mature and formulate a system of higher education, with especial reference to raising up a skilfully trained and competent ministry, that would have done credit to a deliberative body in a time of profound peace! You will, I think, agree with me that it was a grand and impressive spectacle of magnanimity.

3. The Huguenots deserved well of the world as the advocates of the right of individual judgment, and as the inaugurators of a system that could have no other logical result than in the establishment of free institutions. A great principle of the Reformation was the prerogative of the single human being—man or woman, learned or of limited education, ecclesiastic or layman—to read and interpret for himself, according to the best light the Almighty had given him, a Word addressed to and designed for every human being. Over against a despotism in the Church requiring implicit faith and unquestioning obedience, the Huguenot, like his brother Reformers in other lands, set up and maintained, even to the death, the liberty of the individual conscience. To the sacerdotalism of the papal church he opposed the universal priesthood of believers. A man claiming the right to think for himself in matters of religious belief, can be no slave in matters of State. More than he realized it himself, the Huguenot was bound, by the inevitable

tendency of his principles, to espouse the cause of political emancipation. It was false, it was a groundless calumny started by their enemies, that the Huguenots were enemies of the monarchy under which they lived, and that they aimed at turning France into a conglomeration or confederation of cantons framed after the pattern of Berne, Zurich, and other Swiss states. On the contrary, the Huguenots were intensely loyal, loyal even in circumstances where many others would have deemed themselves amply justified in throwing off the intolerable yoke of oppressors. None the less, however, were they the earnest advocates of personal and national freedom. Theirs was the voice that pointed out the danger of absolutism; that called for constitutional guarantees; that would have legislated the regular convocation of the representatives of the people in meetings of the States-General held at set intervals and not at the caprice of monarchs or their advisers; that would have held those advisers to a strict accountability. And what they would have wished to see in the State, they realized to some extent in their own ecclesiastical and political organizations, in their Synods, of which Quick, in his "Synodicon," and Aymon, in his two volumes entitled, "Tous les Synodes," have given us so complete a view; and in their Political Assemblies, bodies of equal interest, of which, alas! we have no similar collections.

The Huguenots would admit of no tyranny, not even of that of their own beloved Henry of Navarre, whom they had themselves elected to the honorable charge of "Protector" of their churches. The most insignificant of their members enjoyed an unquestioned right of appeal from the lowest to the highest ecclesiastical court. Henry of Navarre could claim no more than this. And, in the very Assembly of La Rochelle, to which I adverted a moment ago, even he was compelled to listen, at the mouth of plain commoners, to some unpalatable rebukes.

4. When noble and worthy ends are pursued with unflinching perseverance and a resolution that will rest content with nothing short of success, there is such a display of heroism as cannot fail to challenge the world's highest admiration. That which has invested the name of "Huguenot" with a glory peculiarly its own, that which has transformed an obscure nickname into a badge of honor all the world round, is, ladies and gentlemen, in no inconsiderable degree, the singular courage and fortitude of the men, aye, and the women too, who, in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, were thus designated. The Huguenot, whatever his rank, station, or age, felt assured that the cause he maintained was a good one—nay, that it was the good cause, and, therefore, that it was sure, in the end of things, to prevail. This confidence imparted to his character and to his life a calmness, a dignity, an equipoise, to which others were strangers. He could labor, he could suffer, he could wait with patience. Théodore de Bèze had struck the keynote of his feelings, when, on the morrow of the Massacre of Vassy, he said to Henry of Navarre's timid and treacherous father: "Sire, it is, in truth, the lot of the Church of God, in whose name

I am speaking, to endure blows and not to strike them. But may it please your Majesty to remember that it is an anvil which has worn out many a hammer."

Yes! The Huguenot, having God and time on his side, felt that he could wait patiently, neither overmuch elated by temporary successes, nor again greatly depressed by apparent disasters which must work ultimate advantage.

"Yet is God very gentle," were the words of the obscure Huguenot that cheered Coligny, when borne away, defeated and wounded, from the battle-field of Moncontour. It was this same confidence that the good cause could never be really lost, so long as God lived, that nerved the right arms of the Huguenots to brave deeds, even after the execrable Massacre on Saint Bartholomew's Day, even after the murder of that noblest of their leaders, the immortal Gaspard de Coligny, and tens of thousands of other worthies. The good cause was in no sense lost. Charles the Ninth could not understand it. Cardinal Lorraine could not understand it. Catharine de'Medici, with hands dripping blood, was amazed. Could it be that her toil was all in vain? The Huguenots not aware that they had been defeated! The Huguenots—after the massacre—after the loss of almost every captain of note—when their religion was utterly proscribed—the Huguenots not pleading for their lives to be spared, or to enjoy partial toleration, but demanding the large liberty conceded by the "Edict of January," 1562! This was simply astounding. "Why," exclaimed Catharine, "if your Condé himself were alive and in the heart of the kingdom with 20,000 horse and 50,000 foot, and held the chief cities in his power, he would not demand half so much!"

So it was. After defeat as after victory, the Huguenots had one and only one demand. Not more inexorable was the Sibyl in her valuation of the books, pregnant of fate, which she offered to Tarquin the Proud, than were the Huguenots in the exposition of the only terms on which France could be permanently pacified.

The 17th of January, 1562, when the Edict known as the "Edict of January" was promulgated, was in some respects the brightest day in the Huguenot annals. It is a day worthy of all commemoration; and should the Huguenot Society of America ever desire an anniversary in midwinter upon which to hold its stated meetings, I know of none which, by reason of its associations, is so deserving as this of everlasting remembrance.

For the "Edict of January" was the great charter of the Huguenot liberties. I cannot better exhibit this than by quoting a few striking sentences from one of those long-forgotten papers, hidden away in the dark recesses of volumes now but rarely consulted, in which History seems to live again. I allude to a petition presented by the Protestants of France to King Henry the Third, at the time of the second States of Blois.

"We very humbly beg your Majesty," say they, "since you aim at the restoration of everything in your kingdom to such tranquillity that your

memory may be forever happy and blessed of all, that it may please you to restore to us the liberty of the first edict, made for our relief, so soon as it was discovered that we were altogether different persons, both in matters of religion and in questions of State, from what till then we had been calumniously described to be—the edict which, from the month of its publication, has been styled the 'Edict of January.' We do not, however, ask for it, in particular, because more was granted to us in it than in all the other edicts, although this must cause us so much the more earnestly to desire it—but, rather, because there are connected with it circumstances that should render it agreeable to your Majesty and to all other men, as well as to us pre-eminently. For all the rest, bearing the title of 'edicts of pacification,' are marked with the stamp of troubles and of civil war, the memory of which, whereas it ought to be wholly abolished, is hereby kept up. To this we must add, that to many persons it has seemed that these edicts were not granted by your Majesties of right good will, but rather snatched from your hands by the violence of arms. Whereas the 'Edict of January' had no other basis than the investigation of the facts of the case, at that time peaceable and friendly, when in a full assembly, of such a character as we have already set forth, it pleased your Majesties to assign us a spot where we might, under your protection, serve God according to our conscience and belief. And everybody, Sire, can recall that this Edict of January so well contented both parties that it would have lasted until this moment had not the turbulent audacity of the predecessors of our present enemies broken it with all violence and cruelty, in order to lay from then the foundations of the troubles that have afflicted us and your entire realm of France."

I repeat it, that the Edict of January 17, 1562, which permitted the Protestants to meet for the worship of Almighty God everywhere through France outside of the walled towns, and which pledged them protection as they came and went, is entitled to be regarded as the great charter of the rights of the Huguenots. For its recovery, therefore, during six and thirty years, until the concession of the Edict of Nantes, the Huguenots were content to undergo countless toils, to endure persecutions, wars, massacres, privations without number, which this is not the place nor the time to recount.

Gentlemen and ladies, a cause so noble and so nobly maintained is never lost. Persecution can not kill it, massacre can not kill it. It has the years of God Himself. The question is asked from time to time, "Why did the Reformation fail in France?" It never failed. Its adherents were many of them killed in fire and stream, upon gibbets and on the wheel. But most of them were merely dispersed,—sent in God's good providence to other countries, there to perform on another stage the worthy parts which an unerring wisdom had assigned to them. France herself did not lose them all, though compelled long to hide themselves; for now again, in our own days, the descendants of Huguenots are beginning to reassert

their claim to a land, theirs by right of ancestral sacrifices and sufferings. Meanwhile, other countries, and America among the rest, have gained what France too freely and thoughtlessly parted with—a noble, heroic, Christian race. [Prolonged applause.]

President Jay then called upon his old friend, the Rev. Thomas E. Vermilye, D.D., LL.D., senior pastor of the Collegiate (Dutch) Church, in the city of New York, to make the closing remarks. The octogenarian came forward with alacrity, and, filled with enthusiasm for the objects that caused the formation of the Society, spoke with unwonted vigor and feeling. He said :

The object of this new Society, we are told, is to gather together the sons of the sons of the French Reformers ; to recite and keep alive the deeds of our Huguenot sires, and impress them upon our own memories and upon the minds of our children and their children after them. Of all the noble races of the Reformers, not the least noble, we claim, were they whose lives and principles we commemorate. Who and what they were ; what and why they suffered and what they did ; and what God has done for their children, especially in this land, is to be the object of our researches, and the theme of our grateful acknowledgments. "The glory of children are their Fathers," is the word of divine assurance,—in no instance of recorded history more true than in relation to our Fathers, nor the sentiments their descendants may cherish and proclaim. The Huguenot story rises amidst the monuments of reformed faith, a beautiful and majestic column on the plane of modern history, worthy to attract all eyes and to awaken memories rich and fruitful of noble impulses in the cause of truth and liberty.

The Huguenots never formed a nation nor attained the mastery in their own land ; nor have they anywhere formed a distinct civil State, although they have in many places collected into their own domestic and social circles, and enstamped their religious and moral and even their physical image on many regions where they have located. It is said that a portion of the inhabitants of Canterbury, England, are noted and distinguished from the surrounding population by their graceful forms and politeness of manners ; and that they are descendants of the French refugees who fled to that asylum at the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The same characteristics mark the race in other settlements. But they did not, like the Dutch, form a glorious Protestant Republic ; nor like the Pilgrims, become founders of a New France. Yet may the somewhat lofty phrase of Milton respecting "God's Englishman" justly and without vain boasting be applied to them. They were God's chosen ; and, like precious seed, He scattered them through many nations, and their agency is read in some of the grandest acts in the subsequent historic developments of those nations. Nor is this remark anywhere more applicable than in the unfolding and establishment of our American institutions. It is an object both

just and honorable to rescue from forgetfulness, as this Society proposes to do, the names among them of those celebrated in social, literary, religious, and political life in our past national growth.

It has often been objected against the purity of the French Reformation that the contest was too *political;* religious truth being subordinated to the success of party political strife. Of some of the leaders we may freely admit that this was true, but by no means of all ; and certainly far from true of the mass of the people who were enlisted in the cause, and who formed at one time, it was computed, fully one-half of the entire population of the country. Why they did not prove victors is to be sought in other causes than the lack of zeal in their convictions, or of a self-sacrificing spirit. We are to remember that they arose in the midst of that grand revolution in civil and religious life, when the floods were out ; and men's minds were agitated by problems which began, or rather came to a crisis, at the Reformation ; which have been ever since the staple of many wars, and which have not been finally settled and determined even to this day. It arose out of the condition of things which the attitude of power towards the people had assumed during the long period of mediæval darkness ; when Church and State were combined, and the political necessarily mingled with the religious domain. It was the contest of arbitrary tyrannical civil power with the rights of the people ; when kings were irresponsible and subjects were slaves. It was the contest of ecclesiastical despotism, corrupt, cruel, and unrelenting, against "freedom to worship God." Nor was it possible to separate the two. But was the eighty years' war of Holland with Spain entirely religious, without political admixture? Were there no politics in the Puritan strife when throne and altar went together to the ground? No politics in the thirty years' war in Germany? Indeed, has there been in modern times, at any time, a war in which the two elements have not coexisted in the struggle? The Huguenot motto properly is, "Dieu et mon droit." Why they were subdued when comprising one-half of the people may be readily understood when we reflect that all the engines of power were on the side of their adversaries ; so that Henry of Navarre found it necessary to avow himself a Catholic to secure his throne, which he thought "well worth a mass." Henry ! great in government ; great in war ; great in vice. Nor can the connection of Sully be regarded as of more benefit than injury to the Protestant cause. For by his advice, perhaps more than by any other adviser, was Henry decided to conform ; and throughout the reign he revealed much more anxiety for the king's prerogatives and glory than for the progress of the Church of the King of Kings. While again the bitterness of the dominant class was well shown by the confession of Ravillac, that he was instigated and by high names encouraged, indirectly, if not directly, and with full knowledge, to the assassination, "because Henry had not compelled the Reformed to become Catholic." Yet their name and their cause have not failed nor been buried in obscurity. The seed of the righteous shall continue. They live, they have brought forth fruit, in the achievements of

every people in every realm where they have been sown. And, blessed be God, even now, in beautiful France, the Huguenot church lives and revives. Nor is it vain assurance to believe that under those bright skies, over all those fair fields, shall one day ere long appear an abundant harvest of Huguenot piety, sprung from the persecutions, the tears, the blood, which for ages fattened the soil "where swayed the triple tyrant."

I was recently surprised to read in Bishop Burnet's History the disparaging remark that in Holland he did not find the French Refugees as devout and religious a people as he had expected. Thus their sincerity is impeached at the very time and in the place where they were exiles for the testimony of Jesus, enduring calamities they might easily have avoided had they been so indifferent to their creed that conformity would but little have troubled their consciences. No better evidence of the firmness of their principles could be given than their presence in the land of their exile. In Holland, all records attest that they were a quiet, industrious race, following their own customs, observing their own worship, and doing the duty of good citizens, while the English refugees were distracting the land with their sectarian warfare. There, as elsewhere, we read that the Huguenots were civil without strife, religious without pretensions. And could we believe otherwise of men who had faced the horrors of St. Bartholomew, of the Dragonnades, of La Rochelle, who had bade adieu to home, and kindred, and country, who had abandoned their property to accept poverty and exile rather than renounce their holy profession, rather than simulate in their religious convictions? Were such men either wanting in faith or cold in spirit? Their whole history repels the aspersion. Bishop Burnet was very learned, and his lectures on the Thirty-nine Articles are worth study. He was a splendid preacher, but a marvellously meddlesome man; and as a historian the mere creature of prejudice, and entirely unreliable, where his party spirit or his national predilections, as against the French, were present to control his pen. And perhaps just at that time he was courting that rich, Dutch widow for whom he renounced his Anglican allegiance; and was in a frame little fitting him to appreciate the every-day, God-fearing religiousness of the French exiles, the children of "the church under the cross."

The history of the race in this country has not yet been adequately written; but I am glad to understand that our friend, Prof. Henry M. Baird, and his brother, Rev. Dr. Charles W. Baird, who have both given themselves to this study, may be expected to give us, in due time, such volumes on this, also, as they have already sent forth on the Huguenot story. The materials are abundant in all the localities where the generations have gathered; but they are scattered, and require time and labor to bring them together, and the hand of taste to arrange and present them in historical form. The story, in many of its details, possesses the attractiveness of the purest romance: tender and pathetic in very many of its events, and through all its details rich and impressive in its holy lessons. It tells of men and women who forsook all to follow Christ; the men

having a race characteristic as gentlemen in the true and best sense of the word; the women, "the elect ladies." And a beautiful incident told of the first settlers at New Paltz, in this State, might be a most appropriate frontispiece to such a volume. When the Pilgrims had reached their destination, and had unhitched their teams, their first act was one of devotion. They gathered together; the Forty-sixth Psalm (I think it was) was read; they kneeled in humble prayer, thus consecrating themselves anew, their children and children's children, and their wilderness home, to God the God of their Fathers. And has not the prayer been signally answered in their generations? Has not the promise proved true to them as to God's people of old: "I will be thy God and the God of thy seed after thee?" [Great applause.]

Assistant Bishop Potter then pronounced the Benediction.

THE ANNIVERSARY MEETING.

The Anniversary, or Annual Meeting of the Society, instead of being held on April 13th, the day of the Promulgation of the Edict of Nantes, granting Freedom of Worship to the Huguenots of France, as ordered in the Constitution, Article V., Section 1, was this year, from motives of expediency, held on April 17, 1884, at eleven o'clock A.M., in the Young Men's Christian Association Building, corner of Twenty-third Street and Fourth Avenue, New York. Quite a number of members, including ladies, were present. The President, Hon. John Jay, presided over the deliberations of the meeting, which was most interesting in the reports that were read and the discussions that took place upon measures proposed for the welfare of the Society.

After the reading by the Secretary, the Rev. Alfred V. Wittmeyer, of the Minutes of the previous meeting, and their adoption, the Treasurer of the Society arose and asked that a committee be appointed to audit his accounts for the past year, so that he could read his Report to the Society. By a vote of the Society, the President appointed three gentlemen, who made a thorough audit of the financial condition of the Society, and after checking the Treasurer's bank-book, and all the bills, receipts, and accounts, the Committee made the following written statement to the Society:

"We, the undersigned, having been appointed a Committee to examine the Books and Accounts of Morey Hale Bartow, the Treasurer of the Huguenot Society of America, do find the same accurately kept, and correct in every respect, for the first year of our Society's existence, ending with the Annual Meeting held in the Parlor of the Young Men's Christian Association Building, this, New York City, April 17, 1884.

"W. H. De Lancey,
"J. C. Pumpelly,
"Herbert Du Puy,
"*Auditing Committee of the Society.*"

From the Report afterward read by the Treasurer, the total receipts for the first year were $660, which represents the payment of $50 each by seven persons, for life membership in the Society, and the payment of $5 each by sixty-two persons for annual dues. No one during the first year of the Society's existence was asked for money, all payments having been voluntary, as it was deemed best for the Society to be firmly established before pressing its claims upon members ; but the Treasurer stated that as none but persons of high honor were admitted to the Society, he confidently expected the treasury of the Society would correspond to the names on the roll of membership.

The expenditures for the year amounted to $259.35, which covered the entire expenses of the Society from its inception, including the necessary outfit of books for the Secretary and Treasurer, stationery, printing, advertising, postage-stamps, etc., and books purchased for the beginning of a library, and the expenses connected with the first public meeting of the Society, held in the French Church du Saint Esprit. The money of the Society, not expended, is kept on deposit by the Treasurer to the name and to the credit of the Huguenot Society of America, in the Seventh Ward National Bank of the City of New York, corner of John Street and Broadway. Two separate accounts are there kept in the name of the Society ; one of which represents the receipts and disbursements of the Society, and the other the money contributed toward the Publication Fund of the Society, which can not be used save in the preparation and publication of the Historical Collections of the Society, which are to form an important feature of the Society's contributions to works of permanent value issued for general information, that will possess a standard value for all time to come. See article on "The Publication Fund."

The Rev. A. V. Wittmeyer, Secretary of the Society, made a verbal report or statement of the working of the Society during the first year of its existence, and as acting Librarian of the Society he read a very interesting Report of the Books, Pamphlets, and Manuscripts acquired by the Society through purchase or gifts. Professor Henry M. Baird, D.D., LL.D., and the Rt. Rev. John Todd Quintard, were then unanimously elected Honorary Members of the Society. The following persons, whose claims as Huguenot descendants had previously received the approval of the Executive Committee, were then duly elected by a vote of the Society to be active members : Prof. Wendell Lamoroux, of Union College, Schenectady, N. Y. ; C. W. Maury, Esq., New York ; James E. Wood, Esq., New York ; Frederick S. Sellew, M.D., New York ; Ambrose T. Secor, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa. ; George W. De Lano, Esq., New York ; Frederick Mottet, Esq., New York ; Mordaunt Bodine, Esq., New York ; Lawrence Turnure, Esq., New York ; Theodore F. Quintard, Esq., South Norwalk, Conn. ; Joseph O. Brown, Esq., New York ; F. V. Shonnard, Esq., New York ; Judge Ellis Baker, Court of Appeals, Albany, N. Y. ; T. G. Sellew, Esq., New York ; Henry M. Lester, Esq., New Rochelle, N. Y. ; Rt. Rev. William Stevens Perry,

Davenport, Iowa ; Edward S. Whelen, Esq., Philadelphia, Pa. ; John Henry Dey, Pelham Manor, N. Y. ; Jacob D. Vermilye, Esq., New York ; Mrs. Paran Stevens, New York ; Henry C. Lockwood, Esq., New York ; Ingersoll Lockwood, Esq., New York ; Howard Lockwood, Esq., New York ; Henry G. Marquand, Esq., New York ; George William Ballou, Esq., New York.

The Society then proceeded to elect officers for the ensuing year, 1884–'85, and re-elected the Hon. John Jay, President, the Rev. Alfred V. Wittmeyer, Secretary, and Morey Hale Bartow, Esq., Treasurer, by a unanimous vote. The By-Law of the Society in relation to Vice-Presidents reads as follows :

SEC. 10. The original Huguenot settlements in this country, each one of which is entitled to a Vice-President, are as follows : New York City, Staten Island, Long Island, New Rochelle, New Paltz, Boston, New Oxford, Narragansett, Maine, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Virginia, South Carolina, and Florida.

Each Huguenot settlement in a State is entitled to a Vice-President, whose duties are defined in Article IV. of the Constitution, as follows :

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Vice-Presidents to interest in the object of this Society the Huguenots of the localities which they represent ; to establish there, if it be deemed advisable, branches of this Society ; and in the absence of the President of this Society, a Vice-President shall preside and exercise all the rights and privileges of the President ; and if more than one Vice-President be present, the senior Vice-President in attendance shall be the presiding officer.

But few Huguenot settlements are yet represented by membership in the Society. Other States than New York should be active in this matter. Of the present membership of the Society the following were chosen Vice-Presidents : Edward F. De Lancey, Esq., was re-elected for New York city ; Hon. Chauncey M. Depew was elected Vice-President for Staten Island, N. Y. ; Rev. Ephraim De Puy was elected Vice-President for New Paltz, N. Y. ; Hon. Robert C. Winthrop was elected Vice-President for Boston, Mass. ; and Charles M. Du Puy, Esq., of Philadelphia, was elected Vice-President for Pennsylvania. The Society then adjourned.

A committee of three, consisting of Dr. Edward H. M. Sell, of New York, with the Secretary and Treasurer of the Society, then called at the office of the Young Men's Christian Association and thanked Mr. Williams, in the name of the Huguenot Society, for the free use of the large parlor.

THE SECOND PUBLIC MEETING.

The Huguenot Society of America celebrated the completion of the first year of its existence by a public meeting held in the Collegiate

(Dutch) Church on Fifth Avenue, corner of Forty-eighth Street, on Thursday evening, April 24, 1884. The church is noted as being one of the largest, the most elegant and conspicuously beautiful of all the Protestant churches in the city of New York, and the use of it was generously granted by the Consistory of the church to the Huguenot Society free of cost. Professor Henry M. Baird, D.D., opened the meeting by reading the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, and then offered prayer, after which the President of the Society, Hon. John Jay, made a brief statement of what the Society had accomplished during the past year, and its aims for the future, and then introduced the Rev. Dr. Talbot W. Chambers, who, in the absence of the Rev. Edward B. Coe, D.D., the pastor of the church, spoke as follows :

Ladies and Gentlemen :—In the unavoidable absence of my colleague, Dr. Coe, who has the special charge of the congregation worshipping in this place, I have been called to the pleasant duty of welcoming the Society within these walls to its first public meeting, held in a church where the preaching and the service are in English ; and there is an eminent propriety in such an occurrence, as the link which unites the French and the Dutch Churches is closer than the bond between the French and any other ; and which will be very succinctly and ably presented to you in the course of the evening, and on which I ought therefore not to dwell.

We are told (and there is not a man on this round world whose heart does not respond to the sentiment), " That he who has no ancestors thinks little of ancestry ; while he who *has*, rejoices in it " ; and where is there any comparable to that of the Huguenot ? When they were driven out of France, where they composed the best element of that splendid empire, they went to the East, or to the South, or across the ocean, and left an example of their civic and social excellence to this day. As we glance over the annals of France and America, we find them identified with all that is good, and stable, and useful ; and it is right, therefore, that their history should be perpetuated. Lord Macaulay, speaking in terms of admiration of the bravery and the unfaltering fortitude with which the Huguenots sustained their misfortunes and defeats, says : " A people which takes no pride in the noble achievements of remote ancestors will never achieve anything worthy to be remembered with pride by remote descendants." And it is true.

I remember reading of an English gentleman travelling in France, years after the restoration, that in going through a valley his horse nearly ran over a child. Stopping to see what the result of the accident might be, he fell into conversation with the child's mother and others grouped around them, and he presently found that they were Huguenots, being descendants of the Church of the Desert ; and he learned that they had with them a single copy of the Scriptures, worn almost to fragments, with which they constantly refreshed their faith. In afterward going to the

factory of the firm with which he had business, he inquired about these people. It was said in reply : "They are a silly sort of people, but we never have to weigh their silk." Yes, they brought their silk there for sale, and "their own account of it was always received." "There was no need of re-weighing it ;" and I think, said the speaker, that although the world may call such "a silly sort of people" they are the bone and sinew and the moral strength of any country. [Applause.]

President Jay then introduced the Rev. Dr. A. G. Vermilye, of Englewood, N. J., the son of his old friend, Rev. Thomas E. Vermilye, D.D., who read the following paper :

"THE MINGLING OF THE HUGUENOTS AND DUTCH IN EARLY NEW YORK."

Early New York is, to most of this day and generation, like some "tale of a grandfather" told to the children ; what he relates so differs from the present that they can hardly realize such a past. The romance of the present city lies in its marvellous growth, which has been mainly since 1825. My father, the senior pastor of this Collegiate Church, who has just turned the corner into his eighty-second year, remembers when there was a bridge crossing Canal Street at Broadway. On a hill just above it, and above what is now Bayard Street, stood the farm mansion of the Huguenot Bayard. The city itself, except on the Bowery side, reached but little above Chambers Street. Meadows and swamps lay between St. John's Church, the Lispenard mansion, and the river. Farther up (about 20th Street) was the village of Greenwich, to which stages ran twice a day from Wall Street. All this wonderful change in one man's lifetime ! It has been like the opening out of a lady's fan — which, from a plain and narrow stem, has suddenly expanded into a surface covered, length and breadth, and along every rib, with creations of cost and skill and art. Now go back one hundred years more, *i. e.*, to 1700 or thereabouts. The city lies crouched below Wall Street, with only a paw stretched out along Chatham Street and the East Side. A line of crumbling palisades and earthworks extending originally from river to river, still fenced Wall Street from the open, beyond. And (note in passing) how different Wall Street itself was ! No "bulls," no "bears," no slaughter of "lambs," no "puts" and "calls" ; if not the "golden age," it was the innocent and Arcadian age, of the street. The city itself had, at the time, about 750 houses, 4,500 white inhabitants, and 750 blacks, slave and free. Sidewalks there were none, but from the house, for ten feet on either side, the streets were paved with cobble-stones. Then, to light them upon dark nights, "*every seventh house in all the streets* (says the elaborate city ordinance) *shall cause a lantern and candle to be hung out on a pole* (from the window), *the charge to be defrayed equally by the inhabitants of said seven houses.*" The sole night police were "four good and honest inhabitants," who went round the city every hour, ringing a bell, and proclaiming the state of the weather and the hour of the night ! But with all this civic,

and indeed general Dutch frugality, there were some fine houses. Just out of Wall Street, on Pearl, and facing Pine, was a mansion, recently built by Col. Abraham de Peyster, which was long famous for its size, its costly furniture, its elegant silverware in daily use, its rare old cut-glass and china and pictures; and better yet, famous for Huguenot culture, courtesy, and generous hospitality — things inherited, ingrain, and personal, which money cannot buy. This same Huguenot De Peyster (who died in 1728) left a provision in his will of interest and significance in relation to our present subject. The old Middle Dutch Church on Nassau Street, more recently the Post-Office, was then in process of building. He directed that a *bell* should be procured for it in Holland, at his expense, and it was cast in Amsterdam in 1731. This bell, like some migratory bird whose well-toned throat sends down its music from aloft, after years of sweet service in its original belfry, after more years of hiding in silence, while the British desecrated the sanctuary, after again returning to its oldtime ministry and service of sound, whose varying tones announced the funeral, the marriage, the worship, the fire, in 1844, with minister, and sexton and people, took its final flight from the old Middle. It could only *look down*, with regret or silent contempt, on a Post-Office. Besides, the *sexton* was gone, and what could a bell do without the sexton; for when anything was wanted,

> "They told the sexton,
> And he tolled the bell."

So it went up-town to the church in Ninth Street; migrated again to the one in Lafayette Place; and thence to the steeple of this 48th Street church. Here, every Sabbath, it still summons this Dutch congregation to mingle in service and worship with the graceful and scholarly pastor, whose Huguenot name, if differently written (Caux), has always been pronounced Coe. With this introduction, I pass to my subject, "The mingling of the Dutch and Huguenots in early New York."

When, in 1609, Hendrick Hudson took his first cautious peep into the Narrows, with the little "*Half Moon*," neither then nor afterward did even a half light enter his mind as to the great thing he was doing. There was, as yet, only a Half Moon upon the capacious bay; and upon the shore, the thick shadows of an untouched forest. As for Hudson, his mind was elsewhere, hunting for the impossible, a northern passageway from Europe to Asia. He sailed up the river which invited him northward, left it his name, out again at the Narrows, and home. Thirty days covered and closed (had he but known it as such) his life's great achievement. Again he sailed, out into the unknown, looking for the impossible. A mutinous crew, a little boat cast loose, and then a wandering grave in *Hudson's* Bay—such was the first Arctic tragedy. Four years include all that we know of him. He flared across the horizon, like a brief Aurora, and then disappeared in the cold North.

What Hudson had seen and reported, had no great results for several years. It kept buzzing about, however, in the brains of some capable Dutchmen, who at length hived their ideas in the celebrated "West India Company." Especially had this company been a favorite idea of the more wealthy French Walloons at Leyden. So, when the time at length came, in 1623, thirty families—not all, but "mostly Walloons"—were ready to emigrate. The last of April of that year (*i. e.*, 260 years ago), you might have seen them off Long Island, in the little "*New Netherlands*," jabbering together in French and Dutch, as emigrants now do, of their hopes and fears—the pioneer colonists of New Amsterdam. It was just a chance that these French Walloon Huguenots had not gone to Virginia; for in 1621 Jesse De Forest had written to England for the royal permission for fifty or sixty families to do so. Leyden was just then like bees ready to swarm. John Robinson and his congregation (the younger part) had recently gone. There was commotion and disquiet in the air, and an instinct to remove to safer and better homes. Happily, they came hither; an element not to be depreciated by any other, whether English or Dutch. The three rays which compose the sunbeam, and in turn advance the plant to its maturity, do not quarrel, I take it, when Autumn harvests the faithful work of Spring and Summer. And these early French colonists, with the subsequent arrivals, brought much-needed qualities of their own. They were the yeast in the Dutch cake. They were inventive; skilled in various workmanship; persistent in overcoming difficulties; of a sprightly cheerfulness and an instinctive gentility. They were educated—had even founded a college for themselves in Leyden. They were religious; whom fierce winds of persecution had torn from the native tree, only to sprout again, the same religious people, wherever they touched ground. It was a good and hardy stock, equally industrious, but more versatile, more graceful, more apt in all kinds of culture, than the Dutch. And so, the house built, they began to cultivate; to disentangle the old forest shadows, and let in the sun; to train the wild grape, and strawberry, and the dwarfed native apple, into a richer bouquet; and they introduced, (not cabbages and sauerkraut, but) the quince, the pear, and first regaled the wooing winds of land and sea with the divine flavor of *peaches*. Meanwhile, and within doors, our Huguenots were making at least one memorable contribution to the home-life of the new colony. In early mining days, in San Francisco, there entered the church, one Sunday morning, a woman and child. As the latter was restless during the sermon, the mother rose and was about to leave. But the minister immediately said, "No, do not take that child away"; and then (laying his sermon aside) made the *child* his *text!* It was the first child his audience had seen for months or years; and they were speedily in tears! And we can imagine the twitter and stir, in 1625, when Sarah Rapelyea was born in Albany, and shortly after brought to New York. The Governor gave her mother a cow to mark the event; and a cow was at that time almost as rare and

precious a possession as a child. As Sarah was evidently not a *pair* (pear), undoubtedly everybody called her a perfect *peach*. And so — praise the Dutch, if you will (they deserve it), but the first girl, *i. e.*, the first *peach*, and the first *cradle*, were Huguenot! Sarah Rapelyea had fourteen children, and was the ancestress of the Bergens and Bogaerts. A silver tankard, given to her at her marriage, is still in possession of her descendant, Barney Johnson, Esq., of Brooklyn.

And now, in 1626, everything is well under way. New York island is bought — 22,000 acres — price, $24, in beads and trinkets; if the Indians are satisfied, a most satisfactory transaction all round. The colonists could now

> "Read their title clear
> To *mansions*" (in the future)
> "And wipe their weeping eyes."

They numbered about 200, well mixed, Huguenot and Dutch; and lived in about thirty houses, near the Battery fort. Minuit, the Governor, was Huguenot; his council, Dutch; the Secretary, Isaac De Rasiéres, Huguenot. As yet, they had neither minister nor church. Roughly housed and seated in the loft of a horsemill, on Sunday mornings they had such service as two lay "comforters of the sick" could give them — viz., reading the Bible and prayers. But it kept their piety alive, and doubtless, like the honey gathered from old trees, had an enjoyable sweetness of its own. In 1628, however, Rev. Jonas Michaelius organized the first church of this island. Its form was the Reformed Dutch. Minuit, the Huguenot Governor, was one of its two elders; and at the first communion, fifty members, Huguenot and Dutch, partook of the Lord's Supper. This union of the two (let me say) was entirely natural. For, although these Huguenot refugees (so far as they were concerned) understood little Dutch (and Dominie Michaelius afterward had a separate service for them), yet, the model of the Dutch church was that of the church of France. Both were Presbyterian in form, and dispensed with bishops. Each individual church had its Consistory, or body of elders. Above this was, in France, the Colloquy or Conference; in Holland, the Classis; composed of ministers and delegated elders. Then, the Classes or Colloquys within certain territorial limits united in a *Synod*. And above all, and uniting all, by delegates, clerical and lay, from each Synod, was the National or General Synod — a high Court of Appeals and general legislation for the body. Moreover, their creeds were substantially the same. The Synod of Dort, which sat six months (in 1618), and formulated the Dutch doctrine, was attended by delegates from France, Germany, Switzerland, Scotland, and by four from the Church of England — one of them a bishop, and two of the others bishops afterward. Leaving out everything upon which they differed, and unanimous on everything they put in — except that the English delegates did not vote on the one article of church government —

the Dutch creed represented (with that one exception), as it now represents, the bottom unity of Evangelical Protestantism. Such was the pervading spirit of harmony in Biblical research and prayer, that Bishop (but then Dean) Hall said, on retiring, "that there was no place on earth so like heaven as the Synod of Dort, and where he should be more willing to dwell."

Thus, then, allied by church government and creed, for many years Huguenot and Dutch worshipped together. In 1633, under Dominie Bogardus, the old horsemill gave place to a frame church, much like a barn; but what matter, if the fodder be good and the cattle well fed — as they were. However, in 1642 — also under Dominie Bogardus — this church was replaced by another of stone, built in the fort for fear of the Indians. Dominie Bogardus was a large man every way; doubtless a far-seeing man; and with his frank and electric good-humor, his clerical faithfulness in duty, his energy; and no less, perhaps, his fine and skilful taste in gardening, as well as with vines and flowers (which his French parishioners could well appreciate), and which made his little Dutch parsonage, from sill to chimney, "bud and blossom as the rose"; doubtless he was acceptable to all, Huguenot and Dutch. But there was one act of his life whose consequences to the churches he could not foresee. It was quite the custom in those days to marry widows — especially *well-to-do* ones. Two of his immediate successors did this; but he was the only one of the three who married *Anetje Jans*. Doubtless she was beautiful, petite, sunny, and with winning manners — a good vrouw — and soon beloved by her husband's people. So the record says. But she, also, *had a farm*, of sixty-two acres, extending, west of Broadway, from Warren to Christopher Streets. During his lifetime this farm was called "*the Dominie's Bowerie.*" In 1671 the heirs, unfortunately, sold it to Governor Lovelace. His successor, Governor Andros, seized it for the Crown; and in 1705, the Crown, *i.e.*, Queen Anne — with right royal munificence, donated it to the recently built Trinity Church. Could Dominie Bogardus but have *foreseen* this, doubtless he would have bequeathed it to the *Dutch* Church. But *now* — you who are all, or mostly, I suppose, the numerous heirs of Anetje Jans (never a woman had more), and here is the *flaw* in the Trinity title. Cornelius Bogardus, one of the eight heirs, *refused to sell;* and we are, consequently, all entitled to his eighth of Trinity's property! But alas! do not knock at her doors. Large in various charities, of her own choosing, for such claimants she has only "cold pieces," at any rate, a *cold shoulder*.

I have nothing farther to say about their church relations, after Dominie Bogardus' time, except this: By 1650 — *i.e.*, thirty-five years before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes — the Huguenot element in and about New York had become quite numerous and important. Therefore, in 1652, Dominie Drisius was sent from Holland to assist Dominie Megapolensis, *especially among the French*, as he could preach in English,

French, and Dutch. Thereafter, from the same pulpit (in the Fort) they had for years what to each was the sweetest, the old mother-tongue ; in the morning, the Dutch Bible and hymns ; in the afternoon, the French and Marot's Psalms. But one day, in 1664, the island changed hands. An English governor stepped in ; and behind him the British army ; and their chaplain. Governor Stuyvesant did not like it, as we know ; nor the Huguenot Vice-Governor, De Sille, nor any of them. But the grievance was *red*-dressed, and could not be *re*-dressed. The next Sabbath, after the usual morning service in Dutch, and before the French service, by courteous invitation of the Consistory, the English chaplain began the *first Episcopal service* in New York. It is not safe, usually, for three birds of different feather and ways to hatch in the same nest. One or other is apt to *crowd* — especially the one that gets in the middle. But for many years, I believe, these three obeyed the apostle's injunction, "Be not *high*-minded," and dwelt together in comfortable union. They were together — *i. e.*, Huguenots and Dutch — till, and even after 1687, when Mr. Pieret founded the first separate French church ; for Mr. Daillé, who has been called "the apostle of the Huguenots in America" — "a man full of fire, godliness and learning" — and who came in 1682, was not a separate French minister, but colleague with Dominie Selyns, the Dutch minister, though they divided the field between them by languages.

From this survey of their ecclesiastical connection I now pass (very briefly) to their *social* relations. We must remember that the Dutch emigration practically ceased in 1674, when the English came permanently in. The Huguenot emigration continued later, till the end of the century ; but they scattered more in towns. Much less numerous, therefore, than the Dutch, and especially with the English added, there must have been something fine about this element, since so many of its families immediately became, and continued, prominent. Dr. De la Montagne (for instance) came over in 1636 ; the next year became sole councillor to the Governor ; continued for years in public life ; a man of elegant manners, of a noblesse family, accomplished, who educated his own daughters, and so *well* that they were the most attractive women of the day. It is true, the little city was then in looks crude and primitive. It is like tracing back his present *High Mightiness* the Brooklyn Bridge to its original, the ferry. A *horn* was hung on a *tree*, which the waiting passenger blew, and the ferryman came at his leisure. But society, after all, if small was not so crude and primitive — thanks, largely to the Huguenots. There was, to be sure, a numerous lower class — slaves and laborers (English convicts from Virginia, many of them) — who were profane, intemperate, and lawless. And the first "prohibitory law" of the State had to be issued in 1639, viz., one forbidding "the tapping of beer during Divine service, and after one o'clock at night," which some good Dutch people (it is said) found oppressive. The Huguenots, however, were altogether of another stripe, who mingled the aroma of refinement and culture with the homelier

virtues, and added to Dutch worth just what it lacked, the sparkle of France. Together they made fine households and a fine society. An illustration or two will show this. Bluff Governor Stuyvesant's wife was Judith Bayard, daughter of a Huguenot minister; and his sister became Mrs. Bayard — notable women, both of them. Mrs. Stuyvesant spoke French, Dutch, and English; was a rare musician; in dress, a French woman of fashion; but a gentle, firm, and sensible wife beside the testy Governor. Mrs. Bayard, herself Dutch, and less attractive in society, was also highly educated, and herself taught her three sons in almost every branch of a practical business education. In 1670 the three daughters of Anthony De Milt were the best Latin scholars in the city — not excepting even the Dutch ministers. And in 1668 Governor Lovelace wrote to the King: "I find some of these people have the breeding of courts, and I can not conceive how such is acquired." The same year a club was formed of notable families, at which to know French, English, and Dutch was almost indispensable; whilst education was so esteemed, yet difficult to obtain, that all wealthy families employed private tutors. So cultured was early New York, among the Dutch and Huguenots — beginning where culture always begins, with the women. I said that in appearance the little city — extending only to Wall Street — was crude and primitive. So it was, even in 1670. But had you stepped inside some houses — both Dutch and French — you would have seen furniture in the fashionable styles of to-day — we are but copyists of the past; or had you seen the ladies, you would have seen the hair, and much of the dress, in the very modes of to-day.

These pleasant relations, I must now say, came to a violent end in 1689. William of Orange had invaded England, to drive out James; and all at once the new world was fevered with commotion. Boston expelled King James' officers, and appointed a Committee of Safety. Plymouth, Rhode Island, and Connecticut did the same; and did it easily, because their population was homogeneous and Puritan. Not so New York. The conditions were entirely different. "The burnt child dreads the fire," and even the smell of smoke will excite his nerves. The air was rife with rumors, which were *not* all rumor, of a French invasion and fleet. The Edict of Nantes had just been revoked (in 1685), by Louis XIV.; and men who had been through the fire (and some of them scorched to the bone), in days past, know what a French invasion meant. No wonder that many Huguenots grew thereby excited, in favor of Protestant William, as many of the Dutch and English Protestants naturally *would* be; that *Catholic* fears should prevail, though the Catholics of the colony were few; that James' governor, and his councillors (Phillipse, Van Cortland, and Bayard),— though the latter were members of the Dutch Church and gentlemen of standing—yet not acting *promptly* in the direction of the tide, should be suspected and even abused; that the fever should still grow; and that a heterogeneous population should take sides violently—the popular side being that against the governor and his council in office. All this led up

to the predominance of Captain Jacob Leisler; to a committee of safety, composed of English, Dutch, and French, and to the famous *troubles* under Lieut.-Governor Leisler—resulting in his death upon the scaffold in 1691—"revengefully sacrificed," as wrote the Patroon Jeremias Van Rensselear. These troubles are a subject in themselves. It only falls within my topic to say, that it will not do to call him (as some have done) an "*illiterate usurper*," and his followers the "*lower classes*." For twenty-five years after his death, his friends were a powerful party, *not* of the lower classes. Of his council, condemned to death with him, but not executed, was (for one) Abraham Gouverneur, a Huguenot of character and standing, and grandfather of Gouverneur Morris; Dr. Gerardus Beekman was another, ancestor of Hon. James W. Beekman. Families, ministers, and society were divided. The Dutch ministers were Leisler's opponents, though he had been a deacon in the church; while Daillé, with so many other Huguenots, stood manfully by him till the last.

And so we get back again to 1700, and De Peyster's legacy of the bell. In the picture-gallery at Brussels is a fine painting by Ooms, of Antwerp, entitled "*The Interrupted Lesson*." An aged minister, and a young girl with face of spiritual beauty, are standing at a desk, earnestly studying the Word of God. Suddenly a suspicious noise is heard; their heads are now turned, and they are anxiously listening. Alas! the precious Word must be hidden away, and the "interrupted lesson" cease; for it is suffering and death to be found reading the Word of God! That represents the old continental history.

Next, old and young, they are like birds of passage, and in flight; shot at and hunted, and with danger always in the wind, if, here and there, they lodge for rest and food. How happy—the ocean crossed—at length to fold the weary wing on this inviting Island of Manhattan; to be able to nest again, in quietness and peace; to bring out the old Bible, unclasp the precious Word, and resume "the interrupted lesson," where the loud bell-call of Sabbath worship proclaims freedom regained and forever established to preach, read, and hear God's truth to man. And if, in the onward flow of human generations, a new mother-tongue replace the old in which they pondered that truth, what matter? We have but emptied the waters of our several ancestral streams, with all their wealth, into the broad bay, that includes us all in one; and which, with double mouth, invite all comers, from off the ocean of humanity, to English freedom and the Word of God. Indeed, the very name they brought—these pilgrims for the Word of God—long ago merged itself into the broader *American*. If we have ventured to revive it, at this distant day, it is because it meant character and virtues worth recalling. And we, their descendants, prize and cherish it, as we would sacredly preserve even the rough-hewn cradle and little relics of a mother's childhood and early day. [Great applause.]

President Jay then expressed the pleasure it gave him to introduce the Rev. Dr. Vedder, for many years pastor of the Huguenot church in Charles-

ton, S. C., who came North by invitation of the Society to read a special paper on the Huguenots of South Carolina.

Dr. Vedder prefaced the reading of his paper by saying that whilst Dr. Vermilye and Professor Demarest (who sat upon the platform) were Huguenots in the Dutch church, he was a Dutchman in the only remaining Huguenot church in the United States. He was baptized in the Dutch church in New York City, and assumed his present charge in 1866. Dr. Vedder then read the following paper:

"THE HUGUENOTS OF SOUTH CAROLINA AND THEIR CHURCHES."

By the Rev. Charles S. Vedder, D.D., Pastor of the French Protestant Church, Charleston, S. C.

The first Protestant settlement upon the American Continent was made by Huguenots; and that settlement was within the present limits of South Carolina. Indeed, save the abortive effort of Vasquez de Ayllon, at an earlier date, and at the same place, this was the first attempt, either Protestant or Papal, to establish a permanent colony in what is now our country. The expeditions which preceded these, under Roman Catholic auspices, were either adventurous, predatory, or romantic.

That of Ponce de Leon to Florida, in 1512 — twenty years after the discovery by Columbus — had been in commission to conquer the island of Porto Rico. This accomplished, and its fruits garnered in great wealth to himself, de Leon coveted long life to enjoy his gains. The new world, amid all its other wonders, seemed to offer even this boon. Rumor came of an island further north, where flowed a fountain of perpetual youth. The credulous cavalier sailed in search of this miraculous fountain, and discovered Florida instead. Although, upon returning to Spain, he received permission to colonize his discovery, it had lost attraction for him, and he went back to Porto Rico, to spend the few days which he could neither there nor elsewhere prolong.

In 1541, Fernando de Soto, the discoverer of the Mississippi, undertook the conquest of Florida at his own expense, thinking to reap such a harvest of wealth as he had partially shared with Pizarro in Peru. He traversed the present Gulf States from Florida to the Mississippi, but with no purpose to plant a colony. "The wanderer," says Bancroft, "had crossed a large portion of the continent in search of gold, and found nothing so remarkable as his burial-place" — the dark waters of the river which he had explored.

Even the attempt of Jaques Cartier to establish a settlement, in 1534, in what is now the neighboring province of Canada, was very soon abandoned. The fact that it was made, however, will serve to explain why the Protestants of France so soon had their thoughts and hopes fixed upon the new world.

The French nation was the first to take advantage of the knowledge gained by the voyages of Cabot to North America. As early as 1506, they

had established productive fisheries upon the Banks of New Foundland, and had mapped out the river St. Lawrence. Two years after, a vessel from France carried back thither some of the natives of Canada. In 1524 Francis I. sent four ships to prosecute discoveries in the country, and, ten years after, Cartier made his disastrous attempt to winter in that inhospitable air. A few years further on, de la Roque, a French nobleman, repeated the failure of his predecessor.

It is not, then, strange, that, when persecution for conscience' sake became the rule in unhappy France, the hunted Protestants should look across the ocean for liberty and security. Their illustrious leader, Admiral de Coligny, fitted out an expedition to provide a refuge for his co-religionists. Although it made a landing and formed a settlement upon the coast of Brazil, and was afterward reinforced by two or three hundred men and two ministers of the Gospel, the enterprise came to naught through the unworthiness of Villegagnon, the leader.

In no wise daunted, Coligny dispatched another colony of Huguenot immigrants to America, under the charge of Jean Ribaut. It sailed in the spring of 1562, and arrived safely on the coast of Florida, and formed a settlement at or near Port Royal, S. C., forty-five years before the English settlement of Virginia, fifty-two years before the Dutch colonization of New York, and fifty-eight years before the arrival of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, Mass. At their first place of disembarcation, the Huguenots united in public acknowledgment to God for their safe arrival, and set up a monument, suitably inscribed, to show that they had taken possession of the country for France. That monument, however, showed more than this. No planted cross stood beside it, the symbol of that Papacy which had hitherto alone claimed empire in the new world. The stone pillar of Jean Ribaut was the corner-stone of that temple of Protestantism in the Western Hemisphere which was afterward to rise with shoutings of "Grace unto it," and under whose benignant shelter we sit to-day with great delight.

The story of the failure of this first Huguenot colony is familiar, and need only be told in the fewest words. It arose from circumstances utterly beyond human control. Leaving a number of his companions strongly fortified and fully provisioned, Jean Ribaut returned to France for reinforcements of men and stores. During his absence, a conflagration destroyed the fort and the dwellings of the colonists, and the delay of Ribaut to return immediately, owing to the renewal of civil war in France, reduced the colony to extremity. Even this might have been borne but for the misgovernment of the commander of the garrison, who seemed to lack wisdom in dealing with men. Despairing of relief, the colonists built a rude vessel, and after incredible hardships, under which many perished at sea, a few succeeded in reaching England.

But they had not been forgotten. Laudonniere, who had returned with Ribaut to France, brought, in 1564, three ships and a full complement of men to the infant settlement. He seems to have had intimation of its fate

before sailing. The fact of its abandonment being confirmed, Laudonniere founded a new colony upon what is now the St. John's River. Dissension arose, which led to the separation of some mere adventurers from their number, but this was no misfortune. Ribaut soon joined them, with a fleet of vessels, only to have his ships broken by a furious storm, and to share the destruction of the whole settlement by the Spaniards under the cruel Melendez.

The French Protestants made no further attempt at colonization there. It was impossible that they should do so. Charles IX., or rather his infamous mother, reigned in France. The departure of the Huguenots to America had been permitted, in order to rid the kingdom of their presence and opinions. Another and more effective riddance had long been contemplated. The king was preparing a war of extermination for them at home. While Ribaut was in France, gathering reinforcements for the colony already planted in America, occurred what a French writer calls the true St. Bartholomew — the butchery of Vassy,— where worshipping Protestants, of all ages and sex, fell martyrs to their faith. Like horrors raged elsewhere in France. At Tours the slain men, women, and children covered all the banks of the Loire.

A fierce civil war raged. The hunted Huguenots — like the Jews in the time of Esther — stood for their lives. If we may not justify all their retaliatory acts, we must read them in the light of the circumstances. If they destroyed shrines, Romanism had made shrines the symbols of an implacable hate; if they desecrated the tombs of saints, it was because those tombs had become centres of idolatry, and the saints apostles of murder. "If," says Smiles, "they decapitated beautiful statues, the Guises had decapitated living men."

Eight years after the sailing of Jean Ribaut for South Carolina, France, exhausted by internal war, languished into a peace, which promised to the Huguenots most of the civil and religious rights for which they had contended. It was the hideous mockery of hope. In two years the tocsin of St. Germain L'Auxerrois ushered in the bloody day of St. Bartholomew, and among the ghastly corpses of thousands upon thousands which paved the streets of Paris, and the provinces of France, lay that of the good and virtuous and great Coligny, trampled under the brutal foot of the Duke of Guise,— Coligny, the soul of all enterprise, the centre, under God, of all hope to Protestantism in France.

It is not strange that the attempt at Huguenot colonization in the New World was not repeated. Those who would and could have made it billowed France with their bloody graves — nay, they had found a better world. It was a gracious Providence of God that the expedition of Ribaut did not succeed — that its renewal was left for more propitious days.

The great Huguenot immigration to South Carolina was after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, in October, 1685. But, before this, French Protestants had made their way into the colony.

The date of the settlement of South Carolina is 1670. Landing was made at or near the place of the first Huguenot colony. The colonists were a few English immigrants, under the first Governor, William Sayle. And yet among these few original settlers we find the French names of Richard Batin (or Batton), Richard Deyos, and James Jours. These may have been Huguenot refugees, from among the many who sought asylum in England, long before the Revocation.

In the Secretary of State's office of South Carolina there are found records replete with orders of survey, and grants of land in favor of Huguenot immigrants, at a very early period of the settlement of South Carolina, and before the location of the present city of Charleston. A few of those, collected by the indefatigable industry of the late Thomas Gaillard, of Alabama, — to whose MS., and that of the late Daniel Ravenel, of Charleston, I am indebted for many of the facts hereinafter presented, — may be cited as representative of all. As early as 1678 grants or surveys of land are found in the names of John Batton, John Bazant and wife, Lydia Barnott, Peter Bodit, Richard Gaillard, and Richard Quentin.

The first important accession of Huguenots was in 1680. Charles II. of England sent out a number of French Protestants to raise wine, oil, and silk. We learn from the statement of Thomas Ash, who came out with the first detachment, that they numbered forty-five, and that these were but "half of a greater number" of which the immigration consisted. Weiss, the historian, says that "a more considerable number soon followed in another vessel, chartered by the English Government." Here, then, there was an accession of at least ninety Huguenot refugees to the infant colony during the first year of the establishment of the present city of Charleston. Williamson, in his history of North Carolina, says there were fifty families.*

In 1685, as is well known, occurred the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, which left the Protestants in France at the mercy of merciless fiends. After this there was a constant stream of Huguenot immigration to South Carolina. The representative names of Mazyck and Manigault date from 1686, with those also of Gitton and Foucheraud. These must be names of some who fled from France before the actual Revocation. The Huguenots in Charleston, in the following year, were in sufficient numbers to form a church — or rather, which is more probable, to give prominence and the promise of permanency to a church already formed,

* We seem to learn some of the names of this immigration, when we find an oath of allegiance signed by several French Protestants, Oct. 6, 1685 — before the Revocation. It is in these terms:

"We whose names are herewith subscribed doe promise to beare faith and true allegiance to our sovereign Lord, King James the Second, his heirs and successors, and fidelitie and submission to the Lord Proprietors, and the form of Government by them established by their Fundamental Constitutions."

Signed, among others, DuGue, P. Dutarte, I. Fleur, Bacoz, René, Ayeau, Royer, Pouget; and, Nov. 21, Peter Dumoulin.

1546562

for, in the will of Cæsar Mozé, dated June 20, 1687, bequest is made to the "Church of French Protestant Refugees in Charleston." The purpose of this bequest was, to provide for the erection of another French church on Cooper River.

There were, at this period, four Huguenot settlements in South Carolina,— viz. : on the Santee River, on the Cooper River, at St. John's Berkeley, and in the city of Charleston. The town founded upon the Santee River — like that established by the English in Virginia, and like that also established by Holland Dutch refugees from New York to South Carolina, on the Ashley River, in 1674 — was called "Jamestown." But the Huguenot settlement on the Santee was the locality of a French Protestant church before it became a town. With this colony are inseparably associated the names of Daniel Huger, Elias Horry, and Philip Gendron. Among them are found also the names of Carriere, Du Bose, Foucheraud, Gourdin, Manigault, Michaud, Porcher, Postell, Gaillard, Ravenel, Videau. Here too is found the name, afterward and forever illustrious, of Marion.

If we would know something of the character of these colonists — and, knowing this, know what was true of their fellow-colonists elsewhere — the means are happily at hand. John Lawson, an English gentleman, afterward Surveyor-General of North Carolina, visited the Huguenots of Santee in the year 1700; and from his full and graphic description of what he saw, a brief extract will serve our present purpose. Mr. Lawson says :

"Many of the French follow a trade with the Indians, living very conveniently for that interest. There are about seventy families seated on this river, who live as decently and happily as any planters in these southward parts of America. The French being a temperate, industrious people, some of them bringing little of effects, yet by their endeavors and mutual assistance among themselves — which is to be highly commended — have outstript our English, who brought with them large fortunes, though, as it seems, less endeavor to manage their talent to the best advantage. 'Tis admirable to see what time and industry will, with God's blessing, effect."

Mr. Lawson speaks of the warm hospitality he received at the homes of the principal planters, and of Mons. L'Grand, "a worthy Norman, who hath been a great sufferer in his estate by the persecutions in France," who was equally profuse in offered hospitality. The settlers of Santee occupied themselves in tillage and the procurement of naval stores, as well as their trade with Charleston, and with the Indians. Afterward the history of this locality became closely associated with that of the cotton culture in South Carolina. The "Santee cottons" were, and still are, cultivated by their descendants.

The French colony on the Santee was largely increased by additions from a kindred settlement which had been established on the James River, Virginia. The first pastor of the refugees on the Santee was the Rev. Pierre Robert. The second pastor was the Rev. Claude Philippe de

Richebourg, who had been the Huguenot minister of the colony in Virginia, and who accompanied many of his former flock to South Carolina.

The settlement on the eastern branch of Cooper River, called "Orange Quarter," would seem to have been begun, or at least contemplated, before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. There is on record a deed of conveyance of land from Pierre Fouré to Pierre de St. Julien de Malacare, on the eastern branch of Cooper River, the certificate of admeasurement of which to Fouré is dated February 14, 1684–5. There is also a Latin certificate of marriage, the ceremony of which took place, at about the same time, at the plantation of Pierre de St. Julien. Other information concerning this settlement has well-nigh passed away. The Rev. Mr. La Pierre was the pastor of the church at Orange Quarter.

The colony at St. John's Berkeley was made up of French Protestants, who came hither from the Santee and Orange Quarter. The first intelligence we gain of them is that they consisted of ten families, who had builded themselves a church, and that their minister was the Rev. Florent Philippe Trouillard. He had removed hither from Charleston, and there is still a tract of land in that locality which is called by his name. The French had also another place of worship at "Pooshe," the plantation of the immigrant René Ravenel. The place is still owned by his lineal descendants.

The three churches of French Protestants, to which we have alluded, were merged, at length, in the established church of the colony. The English Church became established by law in 1706. Previous to that, and up to 1696–7, the French Protestants had rested under great disabilities and distresses. Although the charters of Charles II. had authorized the Lords Proprietors of Carolina, in promotion of the settlement of the colony, to grant liberty of conscience, the purpose from the first was to make the Church of England that of the province as truly as of the mother country. This was gradually accomplished. Although there was no direct denial of the right of opinion and worship to the French Protestants, they were compelled to hear their most sacred things questioned by the adherents of the English Church. The perfectness of their Church, the sufficiency of their ministry, the sacredness of their marriages, and the legitimacy of their children were all impugned—doubtless to the regret of the more enlightened of the Church of England, but to the distress of the refugees. Appeal to the Lords Proprietors brought redress in 1692, when Governor Ludwell received instructions "to allow the French colony of Craven County the same privileges and liberties with the English colonists." The French were admitted to citizenship as among these privileges, but this was refused them by the colonists until 1696, when an act was passed making aliens free of the province as citizens, and confirming their titles to lands. The act enumerates sixty-three French Protestants who received the benefit of the law, as petitioners for it, and extends that benefit

to all others who should, in like manner, petition within three months. Liberty of conscience and worship was granted to "all Christians, Papists only excepted." This was the first time that religious liberty was formally allowed to Protestants by the Parliament of South Carolina. But even this act was silent upon the subject of the representation of the French in the Legislature.

In May, 1704, an act was passed making "conformity to the religious worship of the Church of England" a qualification for membership in the Legislature. The law passed the lower house by one vote. The measure was condemned by the land proprietors, and by Queen Anne, but no relief was afforded. Two years afterward the English Church was established in the colony, and aliens were not only disqualified for a seat in the House of Assembly, but even of the right to vote, save under certain restrictions.

It was at this time, and under these circumstances, that the three rural French churches were led to contemplate the merging of their distinctive church order into that of the Establishment. Too poor to sustain, uninterruptedly, their own religious ordinances; subjected to disabilities, even had they been able; offered support for their church and minister by the Government, they gradually yielded. They were not required to disuse their own language. The Episcopal Liturgy, translated into French by Dr. John Durell, for his Majesty's Church of the Savoy, London, took the place of that which had been so endeared to the Huguenots by solemn memories and unspeakable sacrifices. It was because they loved religion itself more than any special phase of it, that they relinquished their own form of worship when the alternative was presented of another form, or none. If it were necessary to vindicate the Huguenots from the charge of being martyrs to prejudice rather than principle; of standing out for unessentials in religion rather than its vital elements, the vindication would abundantly appear in the fact of their voluntary surrender of their own hallowed religious associations to accept others new and strange, but no less pure — their absorption into the Dutch, Episcopal, and Presbyterian Churches of the North, and their conformity with the Established, and, later, in the upper portion of Carolina, with the Presbyterian Church of the South.

But — so strong was the tie of immemorial usage, and so dear the idea of own church autonomy — the merging of the rural churches of Carolina into the Anglican Establishment was long in complete accomplishment. When the purpose was manifest to make the church of the colony conform to that of the mother country, the French settlers, in 1704, petitioned the provincial legislature to be erected into a parish. Two years afterward this was done for them. But the parish relation seems not to have been fully accepted or enjoyed until a number of years thereafter. The Rev. Mr. La Pierre was the only Huguenot minister of whom we know as Orange Quarter, and he seems to have continued his sacred functions until his death in 1728. He was never episcopally ordained, and never

being Rector of the parish, could not have received maintenance from the State. In lieu of this, however, and in confirmation of the fact that his stipend was not appointed and appropriated by Government, he twice received gratuities from the Colonial Assembly.

Pierre Robert, the first minister of the Huguenots on the Santee, is known to have discharged the duties of his holy office as late as 1709–10. Dying in 1715, he was succeeded by the Rev. Claude Philippe de Richebourg, who had been the pastor of the French Church in Virginia, and who, though not episcopally ordained, continued to serve the church on the Santee until his death in 1717. In 1720 the Rev. Mr. Pouderous was fixed there by the Bishop of London, but neither he nor Mr. Richebourg received any regular support from the public treasury. Occasional gratuities came to them, however, from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.

In 1707, it is known that there was still a church and small congregation in St. John's Berkeley, under the ministry of the Rev. Mr. Trouillard. Pastor Trouillard died in 1712, and the distinctive French Protestant organization probably died with him.

Although yielding, from necessity, their church order, the Huguenots of these historic localities yielded nothing of those characteristics which their name has ever since implied. Stainlessly pure, indomitably earnest, of exalted piety and uncompromising integrity, feeling a stain like a wound, and counting life's duties more than life itself, they were worthy of the lineage by which they were ennobled, and have ennobled others. The soil upon which Huguenots were the first to settle, and which they consecrated by their blood, has had no names more worthy than those of her Huguenot children. There is no page of the history of South Carolina unenriched and unadorned by their characters and deeds.

Of the social and religious state of these early settlers of rural South Carolina in the year 1700, we get an impressive glimpse in the journal of Surveyor-General Lawson, from which quotation has been already made. He says of the Huguenot settlement on the Santee:

"They are of the same opinion with the Church of Geneva, having no difference among them concerning punctilios of their Christian faith; which union hath propagated a happy and delightful concord in all other matters throughout the whole neighborhood, living among themselves as one tribe or kindred, every one making it his business to be assistant to the wants of his countryman — preserving his estate and reputation with the same exactness and concern as he does his own; all seeming to share in the misfortunes, and share in the advancement of their brethren."

If we would know something of the individual piety of the immigrants, we have glimpses of it in the familiar but immortal letter of Judith Manigault, the wife of Pierre Manigault, who sailed for Carolina before the fearful Revocation. Intolerable woes drove her family from France, but only that they should encounter unheard-of trials before reaching a place

of refuge. "Since leaving France," she says, "we have experienced every kind of affliction — disease, pestilence, famine, poverty, hard labor. I have been for six months together without tasting bread, working the ground like a slave. And I have passed three or four years without having it when I wanted it. God has done great things for us, enabling us to bear up under so many trials. I should never have done in attempting to detail to you all our adventures. Let it suffice that God has had compassion on me, and changed my fate to a more happy one, for which glory be unto His name."

The family record of the immigrant Daniel Huger, written in 1709–10, closes with these words: "O Lord in Christ, our blessed Redeemer, I here acknowledge, with all humility, that Thy chastisement hath been mixed with mercies. Thou hast preserved us from the persecutors of Thy blessed Gospel, and brought us into this remote part of the world, where Thou hast guided us and blessed us in a wonderful manner, and we now enjoy the benefit of Thy dear Gospel in peace and quietness, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen."

The immigrant Isaac Mazyck set apart as a day of special acknowledgment to God, the anniversary of his escape from France. A record in his Bible, dated 1685, is this: "God gave me the blessing of coming out of France, and of escaping the cruel persecution carried on there against the Protestants; and to express my thanksgiving for so great a blessing, I propose, please God, to observe the anniversary of that day by a fast."

There is a simple incident which tradition records as illustrating the unity, and sympathy, and pastoral beauty of life among the Huguenots of Santee. Mr. Philip Gendron had made a voyage to Charleston upon business, doubtless in one of the large canoes described by Lawson. He had undertaken friendly commissions for many of his neighbors. His return had been so long delayed that fears were entertained that he had been lost. During this period of anxious suspense, on a Sunday, when the minister was preaching, he suddenly paused, and was observed to look intently forward toward the river, as if to assure himself. He then cried, "*Voila Monsieur Gendron!*" The congregation rose en masse, and they and their minister hastened to meet and welcome their neighbor as he ascended the river bank.

South Carolina received an accession of 360 Swiss Protestants in 1732. They settled Purysburgh, on the northeast side of the Savannah River. They came out under the auspices of the Church of England, and had for their Rector the Rev. Mr. Bignion.

In 1734, came the family of De Saussure, so distinguished in the annals of South Carolina, and to one of whom, Gen. Wilmot G. De Saussure, a prominent member of the Charleston bar, I am indebted for invaluable aid in the preparation of this paper.

The last French colony to South Carolina consisted of 138 persons,

under the pastoral care of the Rev. John Louis Gibert. The date of their arrival is 1764. They settled New Bordeaux, in Abbeville County. Their descendants, bearing all the characteristics of their illustrious forefathers, continue to occupy the same localities in South Carolina, and have largely conformed to the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Gibert, who had been one of the "Pastors in the Desert" in France, died in 1773. He was sometimes assisted in the pastoral office by his brother-in-law, the Rev. Mr. Boutiton.

Of the settlement in Virginia, so nearly related to that of Carolina, much might be said, if time permitted. But, indeed, much is said, in a single sentence, by the latest historian of that grand old commonwealth. John Esten Cooke, after alluding to the narrow escape which certain great persons had of settling in Virginia, — Oliver Cromwell, in 1638, Queen Henrietta Maria, in 1651, and Charles II., in 1658, — adds, "What was better for the country was the arrival, in 1699, of the good Claude Philippe de Richebourg, with his colony of Huguenots, who settled at Mannikin, on the upper James River, and infused a stream of pure and rich blood into Virginia society."

We are relieved from the need of extended account of the Virginia colony, by the fact that it is to be fully treated in a forthcoming book from the competent hands of the Rev. Dr. Charles W. Baird. The entire immigration, in 1690 and 1699, was very large. The settlers engaged themselves in the cultivation of hemp and flax, and in the manufacture of linen cloth and thread. The greater part of them, in order to the cultivation of the vine, soon removed to Trent River, North Carolina, and many, including the pastor, from thence again to the Santee settlement in South Carolina. But Huguenot names are still among the best in Virginia.

We return now to the Huguenot settlement in Charleston, and to the church which still survives as the memorial of their distinctive ecclesiastical life. Although the first permanent colonization of South Carolina dates from 1670, the settlement of the present city of Charleston began ten years later—only five years before the Revocation. The first site selected for the city, on Ashley River, was exchanged, in 1680, for the present location. We have seen, among the first colonists, some of French name, and, doubtless, of Huguenot faith. At that very time, 1670, the Huguenots in what is now the city of New York, constituted one fourth of all the inhabitants. "They formed," says Dr. Demarest, in his "History of the Reformed Dutch Church," "after the Dutch, the richest and most considerable part of the population." In 1674, a colony of Dutch, from New York, settled on Ashley River, near Charleston. It is more than probable that Huguenots from New York accompanied them. The accord between the two peoples was almost that of identity. The reasons for their removal were equally powerful in both. Yet the substantial unity between the Hollanders and Huguenots in New York did not prevent the latter from having their own church organization, which under the

Episcopal rule still exists. If any accompanied the Dutch emigration to Carolina, a similar result was to be expected.

The same qualities of character which made the Huguenots exiles from France for conscience' sake, must have made them then, as ever since, a most important factor in the life of their new home. Before 1691, many were made magistrates of the colony. What they were then, as to prominence, may be suggested by what they became afterward. In the war of the American Revolution, Gabriel Manigault, a descendant of Judith, loaned to the Continental Congress $220,000; Henry Laurens was the first President of that Congress—to be worthily succeeded by the illustrious Huguenots of the North, John Jay and Elias Boudinot; in the darkest days of the army of liberty, Francis Marion upheld its falling standard in South Carolina, and Colonel Peter Horry was his great lieutenant; John Laurens, the idol of the American army, received the sword of Cornwallis at Yorktown, at the same time that Cornwallis, as titular Constable of the Tower, held Henry Laurens, the father, prisoner.

Ever zealous in mutual helpfulness, the Huguenots of Charleston formed the benevolent organization still existing in honor and usefulness as the "South Carolina Society," with its motto, "a posteritati."* Louis Timotheé, a Huguenot, established the first permanent newspaper in Carolina.

The date of the first religious organization in the city of Charleston is debated. It is certain, however, that French Protestants first carried the Gospel to the State outside of Charleston. There are grounds for claiming also that they had the first religious organization in that city. The will of Cæsar Mozé reveals a fully established French Protestant Church in Charleston in 1687. Dr. Dalcho, the historian of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Carolina, conjectures that there was an Episcopal Church in Charleston in 1681 or 1682. He acknowledges, however, that neither date is certain. His reasons for believing in the date mentioned are four: 1. The original model of the town contained a site for the church. 2. The Fundamental Constitutions contemplated the maintenance of divines of the English Church. 3. It does not seem probable that Church of England people would remain twenty years in Carolina without a church. 4. Bequest was made in 1681–2 in behalf of a church to be erected.

In answer to the first reason, it must be said that in the parchment grant of lots in the town, now in possession of Gen. W. G. De Saussure, there is no evidence of a site reserved for an English church. There is evidence, however, of the existence of a French church nearly coeval with the first settlement of the present city of Charleston. But even if a site had been reserved in the original plan of the town, this would be no proof of the erection of a church upon it.

---

* See in Miscellaneous Information. [See p. 56.]

As to the second reason of Dr. Dalcho,—viz., that the Fundamental Constitutions contemplated the maintenance of English divines,—the utter indifference of the Lords Proprietors, who were only titled land speculators, to the religious concerns of the colony is emphasized by all historians of Carolina.

As to the third reason,—the English settlers of Charleston were not refugees from persecution, with whom religion was paramount, and they had not the essential elements of their church life. Deprived of these, they may naturally have been so engrossed with the privations and perils which environed them, as to adjourn their church erection and organization until more peaceful and propitious days.

But the fourth and principal reason of Dr. Dalcho warrants a conclusion the very opposite of that which he reaches. The fact of a gift from private parties for the erection of a church building upon their ground, is held to be evidence of the existence of an English church in Carolina as early as 1681–2. The gift is from Originall and Mellicent Jackson, to "Atkin Williamson, cleric," "for and in consideration of Divine service (according to the form and liturgy of the Church of England, now established) to be duly and solemnly performed by him, the said Williamson, his heirs and assigns forever, in our church and house of worship, to be erected and built upon our piece and parcel of ground," viz., four acres and improvements.

Is it not manifest that if this ground was for the erection of a church *within* the city of Charleston, then there could not have been a church site reserved in the original model of the town, and Dr. Dalcho's first reason falls to the ground? For what need of a private gift to supply that for which public provision had been made? The gift could not have been for a second church in Charleston, for we know when a second church was established, and at the time of this gift the little hamlet contained but thirty dwellings. If it was *not* for a church in Charleston, then it proves that the Rev. Atkin Williamson was not serving the colony in any clerical function, for this was to provide him one, and he cannot be the starting-point of English church history in Charleston. It did not provide for a church in the country, for as Dr. Dalcho himself says, there is no record of an Episcopal service outside of Charleston before 1700.

The gift appears to be a generous but vain effort of two truly pious hearts, affected by the destitution around them, to utilize the presence of an English clergyman, who, without charge, commission, or credentials, was in the settlement. As the clergyman could not meet the conditions of the grant — church erection and organization — neither he nor others derived benefit from it.

Where shall we look for the grounds of this failure? Shall it be in considerations which forbid that the great and honored Episcopal Church should claim Mr. Williamson as its pioneer in the State and city which willingly accord to it such respect, admiration, and reverence? How are

we to interpret those significant words of the contemporary historian, Oldmixon, himself a pious and zealous Church of England man, when he says of Mr. Atkin Williamson: "Since Mr. Marston has said so much about him, I will say no more!" Mr. Marston was the rector of St. Philip's.

The presumptive proofs that there was no church upon the claimed site in the original model of Charleston, even in 1685, are curious and cumulative. One will illustrate. In all early designations of locality, the church formed, when possible, the prominent and permanent indication. And yet, in a case where this rule must be followed, if it could be, it was not. In a conveyance of a lot in what is now Broad Street, dated October, 1685, from Theophilus Paty to James Varn, Broad Street is spoken of as "running from the seaside to the *Market Place*," and not to the church which is claimed to have stood upon the market-place. Dr. Ramsay dates the first Episcopal church in Charleston, 1690; Holmes in 1696. Ramsay puts the French church later than these, but he did not know of the will of Cæsar Mozé, nor of other facts yet to be mentioned.

If, then, the Huguenots were in the colony in large numbers for five years without a church, — a thing inconceivable of men who were only permitted to come to the settlement upon the credentials of their church membership abroad, and to whom the forms of their religion were "what the leaves of the tree of life are to its fruit," and other forms were in an unknown or unfamiliar tongue, — still the certain date of 1687 stands.

But an earlier date may be far more than presumed. The comparatively large immigration of 1680 were Huguenots seeking religious privileges, and by the elasticity of their polity, measurably unfettered in securing them; by law, the agreement of seven persons among them constituted them a church. That they should have been a single year without availing themselves of these facilities is incredible. The colony came from London, where they had been connected with French churches. Thither many French pastors had already fled — more, doubtless, than could find charges. We find, afterward, the names of several Huguenot ministers of whom we are not told when nor whence they came into the colony. It is by no means a violent supposition that some of these came in the emigration of 1680. But even if, at that time, there were no ordained clergymen in the colony — if, contrary to all precedent, refugee Huguenots had crossed the ocean to find new homes without a pastor with them — yet there may have been ordained elders, who, as authorized by the French Protestant polity, conducted the services of the congregation, and formally constituted the church. This was precisely the state of things among the Huguenots of New Bordeaux, at a later period. That church was served for years by elders alone.

There is documentary proof that this fair presumption is fact. In the Secretary of State's office of South Carolina, there is the record of a warrant — a copy of which I have — dated March 3, 1681, in which the Surveyor-General lays out the present Huguenot church lot — No. 65 — to

Michael Lowell, with the marginal note, "French Church." The same marginal note, "Fr'ch Ch'ch," is on the parchment grants of the town lots of Charleston, opposite the same lot. The "Michael Lowell" is doubtless "Michael Lovell," the name Lovell being French, and found among the early Huguenot settlers of Charleston. The explanation of the grant to an individual is easy. The right of incorporation was not given until long afterward, and the conveyance of land must perforce be to a person. Precisely the same course was taken in the grant of lots Nos. 92 and 93, which were afterward given to the church, and which, until they were sold in later years, formed a large part of its endowment. The right to these lots vested, at first, and for the behoof of the church, in Henry Le Noble and Peter Burchet. They were in a marsh, outside of the town and the line of defence, and were then comparatively valueless. There is ground for conjecture that they were granted in order to the creation of a better church edifice than we find existing in 1687. It is reasonably certain, therefore, that the site where the French Protestant Church now stands, was granted to Michael Lovell for the purposes to which it has been ever since devoted. The marginal references are inexplicable upon any other hypothesis. This fact justifies the belief that the date of the Huguenot Church in Charleston must be 1681 or 1682. The time required for the rude structure of the colony must needs be brief, and the hearts that coveted it were not such as wait.

The first French Protestant pastor of whose arrival in Charleston we have definite knowledge, was the Rev. Elias Prioleau. He had been the devoted minister of the church in Pons, France, and was banished thence in 1685. He arrived in Charleston the following year. He began immediately to serve the church in Charleston. Associated with him, and possibly domiciled in Charleston before him, was the Rev. Mr. Trouillard, of whom mention has been before made.

The records of the early church were destroyed by fire in 1740.? We are therefore deprived of authentic information as to this most interesting period of its history. The church was then, as now, Presbyterial. The Confession of Faith was and is that adopted by the Reformed Church of France in 1539.

A Liturgical form has always been used in the church. The form first adopted was probably that of the church of Geneva. After the fire of 1740, the liturgy of the churches of Neufchatel and Valengin was adopted, and is still used. This book was published in 1713. Tradition says that the minister usually offered an extempore prayer after the confession, and before the sermon. This was in accordance with the liberty allowed in France and Switzerland. A like freedom is enjoyed in the present church at Charleston, although the extempore prayer follows the sermon. The Book of Psalmody was the version of the Psalms of Clement Marot and Theodore de Bèze, which was afterward printed with the notes, and bound with the Bible. The singing at the first was congregational.

The church was originally styled "The French Reformed Church of Charleston." In 1783, after the American Revolution, it was incorporated as "The Calvinistic Church of French Protestants." In 1826, the name of the corporation was changed to that of "The French Protestant Church of the City of Charleston." It is very generally and appropriately known, however, as the "Huguenot Church." The hours of Sabbath service, at first, were made to depend upon the tides, in order to accommodate those of the congregation who lived out of the city.

The first pastors of the church, as we have seen, were Elias Prioleau and Florent Philippe Trouillard, who probably served as colleagues, and without compensation. They seem also to have served the rural French churches. We have no authentic record of the successors of these holy men. Mr. Trouillard we find afterward statedly serving the church at St. John's Berkeley, where he died in 1712. Pastor Prioleau died in 1699, and was buried at his farm on Back River. Three of his lineal descendants, Dr. J. Ford Prioleau, Samuel Prioleau Ravenel, and Daniel Ravenel, are now honored and beloved elders of the church of which their pious ancestor was the first known pastor. These elders, together with the Hon. Robert N. Gourdin and Col. Peter C. Gaillard, form the present Consistory. Many of the communicants and congregation are also lineal descendants of Pastor Prioleau.

In 1712 we find the Rev. Mr. Boisseau pastor of the French church. How long before that time, and how long after, he ministered to the congregation, is uncertain. Difficulty was experienced in securing a pastor. Two letters of Isaac Mazyck are extant, dated 1724, addressed to Mr. Gourdin, a colonist then in London, showing the effort to secure a minister. During this time the services of the church were probably in some manner maintained.

In 1731 the London Walloon church received a letter from the French church in Charleston, asking that a minister be sent them, whose salary should be £80 per annum, with £25 for his passage. The letter is signed Peter Fillen, Etienne Momier, Matthew Boigard, Jean le Briton, Andre de Veaux, Antoine Bonneau, Jacob Satur, Joel Poinset, Jean Garnier, Jaque le Chantre, C. Birot.

There is evidence that, from some period undetermined, to 1734, the pastor of the French church at Charleston was the Rev. M. Lescot. From 1734 to 1752, the pastor was the Rev. Francis Guischard. From 1753 to 1758, the Rev. John Pierre Tetard. From 1759 to 1772, the Rev. Barthelemi Henri Himeli. From 1774 to 1780, the church was served, probably as a stated supply, by the Rev. Pierre Levrier. From 1780 to 1785—the latter part of the Revolutionary War, and the desolation which followed it—the church was without a minister. From 1785 to 1789, the Rev. Barthelemi Henri Himeli, who had returned to Charleston from Switzerland, was again pastor. From 1791 to 1795, the Rev. John Paul Coste was minister. During his term of service, a pleasing and significant

incident occurred. In the year 1793, the city of Charleston was the scene of a grand civic pageant in honor of the French National Assembly. Two days were devoted to the celebration; on the first day the church bells were rung and chimed, and on the second an oration was delivered in St. Philip's Episcopal Church, by the Rev. Mr. Coste, the Huguenot pastor. As the procession, headed by the Governor, Chief-Justice, Chancellors, Speaker of the House, and other public officers, passed before the French Protestant Church, the French Consul, Monsieur Mangourit, halted the procession, uncovered his head, and saluted the church with the French national colors. This was done, said the public journals of that day, in expiation of the persecution of Louis the Fourteenth against the Huguenot fathers of this sanctuary. This tribute was tasteful and beautiful — the only one possible, perhaps, to the man and the time.

From 1795 to 1796, the Rev. Peter Daniel Bourdillon was pastor. At the very outset of his ministry, the church building was blown up to stay the progress of a fire. The devoted pastor had made such efforts to save the church as to bring on a fever, which terminated fatally. He was to have preached a sermon on the fire, in the Archdale Street Congregational Church,— which, with many others, was offered for the use of the French congregation,— but before the appointed day, Pastor Bourdillon had rested from all earthly labors. The church, under the presidency of Mr. John Huger, provided for the expenses of the burial; for the present comfort and return to England of the widow; and also an annuity which continued until her death, in 1816, and during the minority of her son.

From 1796 to 1805, the period immediately following the destruction of the church, there was no regular minister. From 1805 to 1808, the Rev. Marin de Larny was pastor; after which, for several years, the church was without a stated minister. From 1816 to 1819, the Rev. Robert Henry was pastor, who preached alternately in French and English, until he was called to a professorship in South Carolina College. From 1819 to 1823, the pastor of the church was the Rev. Mr. Courlat. Even the partial disuse of the French language by Dr. Henry gave dissatisfaction, and the calling of Pastor Courlat marks a return to the purely French service. The attempt failed, in the presence of the fact that French had ceased to be spoken, or generally understood, especially by the children of the immigrants. The congregation had so diminished that a resolution was adopted, in 1828, to reopen the church with the service wholly in English.

The committee appointed to make the change consisted of the Hon. Elias Horry, Chairman, and Messrs. Joseph Manigault, William Mazyck, senior, George W. Cross, Daniel Ravenel, Thomas S. Grimké, and William M. Frazer. Messrs. Horry, Cross, and Grimké offered to make the translation, and the work was committed to their competent hands. Each of these gentlemen made a separate translation of the Confession of Faith, and these being compared, a version was agreed upon, reported, and

adopted. It now forms a part of the Service Book of the church — the French and English in parallel columns.

The Liturgy is a translation, made at the same time and by the same committee, of that immemorially used in the church — the Liturgy of Neufchatel and Valengin. Some changes were made in order and arrangement, and some additions, copied from the Book of the French Church in London, and kindred sources. Some occasional and concluding prayers were supplied. The sources from which the Book of Common Prayer was furnished were laid under tribute. As the Reformed Church of France had no burial service * — their interments being in silence, and at night (in consequence of their being prohibited in the daytime by the Government) — the committee had either to prepare one altogether new or adopt one already in use. They concluded on the latter plan, and chose the Scriptural and impressive service for the dead of the Protestant Episcopal Church. As the Church of France — or a large portion of it — generally observed, by special service, the great events in the life of our Lord — whilst rejecting all Saints' Days — the church in Charleston has always kept Christmas, Good Friday, and Easter.

When the work assigned to the committee was completed, an experimental service was had. Elias Horry read the Liturgy at morning worship on Sunday, and friends assisted in the Psalmody. The work was fully approved, and the service printed. The Rev. Daniel Du Pré, of the Methodist Church, of Huguenot descent, was invited to serve the church as its stated supply. The service, conducted in the old church, with free seats, was well attended.

In 1844, it was determined to take down the old church building, and erect another upon its historic site. The plan was carried out, and in 1845, May 11th, the present tasteful and graceful gothic edifice was opened for public worship, under the pastorate of the Rev. Charles Wallace Howard, of Georgia, a minister of the Presbyterian Church. Mr. Howard's ministry was so successful that an additional French church, in another portion of the city, was contemplated. But the failure of Mr. Howard's health, in 1849, his enforced cessation from labor for two years, and his lamented resignation in 1852, interrupted and finally defeated the project. During the time of Mr. Howard's inability, the church was supplied, successively, by the Rev. D. X. Lafar, the Rev. Mr. Bartlett, and the Rev. Dr. F. R. Goulding. The Rev. G. H. W. Petrie was elected

---

* "The Liturgies of the Reformed Churches on the Continent supply us with few examples of a service for burial. The danger of superstitious observances, at the period when those formularies were compiled, deterred Calvin and others from furnishing any prescribed order. It has always been customary to consecrate the last offices at the grave with prayer; but for even this, the French Liturgy gives no form."—Rev. C. W. Baird, D.D., "Book of Public Prayer."

The Episcopal burial service was originally taken from the Catholic, but was revised and altered.

assistant to Mr. Howard, and upon the final retirement of the latter, was chosen pastor, in which relation he remained until 1854. The Rev. J. P. Tustin, then a Baptist clergyman, now a presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church, supplied the pulpit for a number of months. In 1859, the Rev. T. R. G. Peck, of the Reformed Dutch Church of New York, was called as pastor, and held that relation until his resignation in 1865. During a portion of Mr. Peck's ministry, as the church was in immediate range of the Federal batteries which bombarded Charleston, service was held in the Second Presbyterian Church ; when, in time, the shells reached there also, the services were discontinued, and the congregation largely dispersed to other parts of the State.

As soon after the American civil war, as means could be provided for the repair of injuries done to the church by the bombardment, it was opened again under the temporary ministry of the Rev. Dr. F. A. Mood. In 1866, the present pastor, the Rev. Charles S. Vedder, was called, who entered upon his ministry November 18th of that year.

The church edifice is adorned with mural tablets, of great interest and beauty, to the first known pastor, the Rev. Elias Prioleau, to the immigrants, Isaac Mazyck, Louis Gourdin, Isaac Porcher, M.D., Antoine de Saussure, Elias Horry, Daniel Huger, and to the revered elder who has passed away during the present pastorate ; who, by the universal suffrage of the community, reproduced in himself the exalted virtues of Huguenot character ; to whom, under God, the church owes its resuscitation and present prosperity ; and of whom Hugh Swinton Legare, the Attorney-General and acting Secretary of State of the United States said : " DANIEL RAVENEL ! Ten such men would save a city ! " The name *Manigault* is commemorated by the only family vault in the cemetery of the church.

The Huguenot Church of Charleston was in possession of a moderate pecuniary endowment, to which, under God, it owed its preservation from absorption into other religious bodies. This endowment was impaired by the late war, and is now only partial. A better endowment, however, and one which it was less able to spare, has been largely lost — the endowment of many honored names, once inseparably associated with its life. Through the frequent closing of the church, because of the difficulty of securing a French pastor ; the continued use of the French language, when it had largely ceased to be understood ; the isolated attitude of the church organization in America ; the forming of other social and religious ties, with, perhaps, a measurably fading memory of Huguenot traditions — now everywhere grandly reviving — through these and like considerations, comparatively few of all the heirs of Huguenot lineage hold fast to the memorial church which perpetuates it, whilst they are found prominent in every other communion of our city and State. If the fact may be explained by the circumstances of the case, it is none the less to be lamented. It renders the duty more impressive and imperative upon those who still adhere to the heroic Church of the Fathers, of single-hearted devotion to its

preservation and prosperity. Like the white plume of Navarre, worthy then to be the oriflamme of Huguenot victory at Ivry, it points every heir of that race the way to follow; yea, representing and reproducing the banner which God placed in Huguenot hands to display because of the truth, when truth was outlawed in France, and bathed in the tears and blood of its defenders, it calls to every child of Huguenot ancestry to range himself under its stainless folds! [Great applause.]

After the conclusion of the foregoing paper, the Rev. Dr. Vedder spoke as follows:

One of the members of my church, who loves the church with a passionate devotion, ay! loves the very dust it rests on, has suggested to me the possibility that there might be some persons here who would care to have a little memento of the little French Church at Charleston, and so he had two or three hundred engravings of the church struck off, which he begged me to present to anybody who should care enough to receive them; and I hope there may be some who will care to have this little memento of our church, in order that you may be reminded when you come to Charleston that you have a home there, and friends there, of your own blood and kin, and that we shall be more than glad to have you, and receive you, and welcome you, and if there be such, I shall be glad.

[The memento was distributed by the Rev. Dr. Vedder to members of the Society after the close of the meeting. The letter-press on the engraving of the church read as follows:

"Established by French Protestants, Refugees from France an account of Religious persecution. Their Descendants, venerating that steadfastness to principle so conspicuous in their Ancestors, continue to worship To-Day with the same Liturgy (translated), published at Neufchatel, in 1737 and 1772, in this, the Only Huguenot Church in America.

1884."]

The Rev. B. F. De Costa, D.D., then made a few remarks, after which the meeting was closed with the benediction.

THE PUBLICATION FUND.

The Huguenot Society of America, to carry out one of the chief objects of its organization, proposes during this, its second year, to publish the first volume of its projected "Collections on the History of the Huguenots in America." The plan is to print, and thus preserve, such existing manuscript original records, documents, and papers relating to, or illustrative of, the first settlements of the Huguenots in the different colonies of America, now forming the United States, as may possess such historical, biographical, and genealogical interest as will preserve and illustrate the origin on this continent of that Huguenot element which has shaped.

directly or indirectly, to a much larger extent than is generally believed, the civilization and the political, religious, and social history of the American people. It is proposed to print these records in the order of the dates at which the several Huguenot settlements in America were made. That in Florida was the earliest but of it none are now known to exist in this country. That on Manhattan Island was the next, and the oldest manuscript records here are the registers of the *French Church du Saint Esprit* in this city. These it is proposed to publish as the Society's first issue, in an octavo volume of about 550 pages, to be printed word for word as in the originals, with a full index of names, and preceded by a brief explanatory introduction. These registers contain the baptisms, marriages, and deaths of the Huguenots of New York from 1686 down to 1804, when the church became Episcopal. The records since that date it is not proposed to include in the volume.

In 1670, Huguenots formed about one fourth of the entire population of this city. In 1689, there were 200 French Protestant families dwelling on this island, and now, two centuries later, their names and descendants are not only still here, but are also found in almost every State of this widely extended Republic. The registers of the Church du Saint Esprit authenticate the baptisms, marriages, and deaths of all its families, and other French Protestant families who came here at a later date, of every rank and station in life. They should be made accessible to all of their descendants, wherever they now dwell, and also to the historian, the biographer, and the genealogist.

They are liable, too, while in manuscript, to total destruction by fire, although, by a merciful Providence, they have escaped those great fires of 1776, 1778, 1835, and 1845, which respectively laid such large portions of New York in ashes. Printing them now will preserve them forever.

Hundreds of the names and families whose ancestral records they contain are as familiar to our ears to-day as they were to those of the New Yorkers of the seventeenth century, such as Allaire, Aymar, Bayard, Boutillier, Badeau, Bartow (Bertaut), Bowdoin, Boudinot, Coutant, Chardavoyne, Crommeline, De Peyster, Devoe (De Vaux), De Lancey, De Milt, Du Puy, Durand, Depew, Dominick, Fortin, Fournier, Gallaudet, Gautier, Girard, Goelet, Gailliard, Huet, Humbert, Iselin, Jay, Jacot, Keteltas, L'Amoureux, La Coste, La Vigne, Le Conte, Le Roy, Lorillard, Luqueer, Mercier, Morel, Nicolet, Neville, Prevost, Quartier, Quintard, Ravaud, Renaud, Richard, Romaine, Soulice, Sicard, Targè, Tillou, Turnure, Valleau, Vallete, Vermilye, Verplank, etc., etc.

While those now no longer heard, save as baptismal names, are represented to-day by lineal blood descendants in the female line in equal, if not in greater, numbers, as Arden, Barbarie, Belair, Bontecou, Bonrepos, Bertrand, Carrè, Collin, Desbrosses, Fanueil, Fresneau, Garnier, Lespinard, Le Breton, Morin, Moulinars, Neau, Pintard, Roux, Rossell, Tiers, Tétard, Vezien, Vinet, Vincent, and many others.

The volume will be issued under the supervision of a competent Standing Committee on Publications, and will be edited by the Rev. A. V. Wittmeyer, the able Secretary of the Society, who has begun to prepare the manuscript for publication. But it must be understood that it will not be put to press until sufficient subscriptions are received to defray its cost. To accomplish this, money is urgently needed, and it is to be hoped that all of Huguenot ancestry, and all interested in preserving the historical records of a people who have so strongly impressed themselves on American civilization and society, will consider it a privilege to contribute for the accomplishment of such an object. If, from all sources, a greater sum is contributed than may be necessary to publish the first volume of the Society's Historical Records, whatever is not required will be kept in a trust company as so much on hand toward the cost of the next volume of the Collections. In response to the published *Statement and Appeal* of April 17, 1884, issued by the Society at its last public meeting for this purpose, the following subscriptions have been made: Henry M. Lester, Esq., New Rochelle, N. Y., $15; John E. Morris, Esq., Hartford, Conn., $10; Rev. Boyd Vincent, Pittsburgh, Pa., $5; Rev. G. L. Demarest, Manchester, N. H., $15; Abram Du Bois, M.D., New York City, $10; T. G. Sellew, Esq., New York City, $10; Theodore F. Quintard, Esq., South Norwalk, Conn., $10; Miss Charlotte Mount, New York City, $10; Prof. E. M. Gallaudet, Kendall Green, near Washington, D. C., $5; J. Collins Pumpelly, Esq., Morristown, N. J., $10; Mrs. Jacob Smith, Freeport, Long Island, $3; Josiah H. Gautier, M.D., New York City, $25.

No personal solicitation has yet been made for money; all has been voluntary. Notwithstanding the recent financial depression, it is surely worth the effort, and if all will contribute, it will be but a slight effort, to render permanent records of the utmost value to thousands of Huguenot descendants scattered all over the land. All sums intended for the Publication Fund can be addressed to the Treasurer of the Society, Morey Hale Bartow, care of the *New York Observer*, 31 Park Row, New York City, who will acknowledge the receipt of the same.

Every life member and every active member of the Society, whose dues are paid, will be entitled to one copy of each volume of the Collections published.

THE OFFICIAL ARMS AND SEAL.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Society, held at the residence of the Hon. John Jay, June 2, 1884, the subject of a device and seal for the Society was brought up by Mr. Bartow, the Treasurer, who had given the matter much consideration. After an interchange of views, the subject was referred by the Executive Committee to a Special Committee, consisting of President Jay, Mr. Bartow, and Mr. De Lancey, with power

to determine upon, and have engraved, such device and seal as they should deem appropriate.

The arms and seal printed on the title-page of this publication, mainly the design of Mr. Bartow, was unanimously adopted by the Special Committee as the official arms and seal of The Huguenot Society of America.

The arms emblazoned :

SHIELD.—Three fleur-de-lis ; *or*, two and one, on a field, *azure*, (the arms of France in the days of our Huguenot ancestors,) impaled with the thirteen stripes, paly, *gules* and *argent*, of the United States.

CREST.—On a wreath, *azure* and *gules*, an open Bible, radiating rays of light.

MOTTO.—"*Verité sans peur*" (Truth without fear), emblematic of Huguenot principle.

The seal shows these arms, surrounded by a riband bearing the legend, "THE HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF AMERICA, FOUNDED IN 1883," with the thirteen stars adopted by Congress as a part of the crest of the United States, arranged around the inner line of the riband ; six on the right side of the shield and seven on the left.

A HUGUENOT LIBRARY.

During the first year of the Society's existence, the nucleus of a library was formed, which already consists of some two hundred books, pamphlets, and manuscripts relating to Huguenot history and genealogy. It is desirable to make as complete a Huguenot Library as the generosity of members of the Society and the liberality of its friends can accomplish for so laudable a purpose, so that it may serve as a Reference Library on all subjects relating to the Huguenots. Such a library will be a valuable acquisition to the city of New York, and to the citizens generally of the United States. Some of the more recent publications relating exclusively to the Huguenots, have been imported for the Society from France. The Society has also received generous donations of books, some of them being quite expensive ; others, privately printed, and others now out of print, that are quite rare.

Among the manuscripts recently acquired by the Society, are four bound volumes giving very complete extracts from the registers of the French churches of London formed by the Huguenot exiles. These Church Records were copied by Gabriel Ogilvy, and were obtained from England at a cost of $64 for the Society, as the gift of Abram Du Bois, M.D., of New York, to whose liberality the Society is also indebted for other books.

The Society has no expenses other than incidental ones ; having no rented office, and all its officers give their time and services to the Society without charge. The money received from the annual dues and life memberships has been sufficient to cover all incidental expenses, form the nucleus of a library, and leave a balance in the treasury. It has no debts.

Akin to this subject and of interest to members of the Society is the following resolution offered by Mr. Bartow, the Treasurer, at the meeting of the Executive Committee held at the residence of the Hon. John Jay, April 1, 1884, prior to the Annual Meeting, and unanimously adopted :

"*Resolved*, That the President of the Society, by virtue of his office, and as Chairman of the Executive Committee, shall appoint in writing, annually, from the members of the Huguenot Society of America, a Standing Committee of three persons, to be known as The Committee on Publications and Library of said Society, who shall supervise all publications to be made by the Society, and sanction all purchases made for its Library. Such appointments to be made within fifteen days after each Anniversary or Annual Meeting of the Society."

In accordance with this resolution, President Jay appointed the Rev. Dr. A. G. Vermilye, Edward F. De Lancey, Esq., and the Rev. Dr. B. F. De Costa, a committee to serve for the year ending with the Annual Meeting in 1885.

NAMES OF HUGUENOT REFUGEES WHO EMIGRATED TO SOUTH CAROLINA.

Collected by the late Thomas Gaillard, of Alabama ; formerly of Charleston, S. C.

Allaire, Allegné, Amamin, Anthony (Antoine), Ardouin, Arnott, Audebert, Aunant, Aveaux, Aveine, Avila (now written Aveilhe), Aymeni.

Bacot, Baerd, Balloh, Balluct, Barineau, Barnott, Barrett, Basson, Baton, Bayes, Baylard, Bayle, Bazant, Beauchamp, Beinayme, Bejeau, Belan, Belier, Bellfaye, Bellot, Bellune, Benoist, Berand, Berteaud, Bertomeau, Besseleau, Billon, Birot, Bisset, Blanchard, Blanchet, Bochet, Bodit, Boigard, Boisseau, Boissiere, Bollomas, Bollough, Bonhope, Bonhoste, Bonique, Bonneau, Bonneau, Bonnell, Bonnet, Bonnetheau, Bonnoit, Boquet, Bordajean, Boshere, Bossard, Bouchillon, Bouchonneau, Boudinot, Bourdillon, Bourreau, Bourquin, Boutiton, Boyd, Boyer, Bremare, Bressau, Brigaud, Bronssard, Bruguet, Bruneau, Brunett, Buche, Bulleine, Bullenat, Burelet, Burgeaud, Burtell, Buttall.

Cadeau, Cahusac, Caillabœuf, Caradine, Carion, Caroone, Carriere, Cartan, Challion, Chardon, Charreau, Chastain, Chastaigniers, Cheavoux, Cherenoux, Chevallier, Chicken, Chinners, Chovein, Christie, Cleninge, Cluzeau, Collin, Coram, Corbett, Cordes, Cothonneau, Couillandeau, Coulliet, Courage, Coureir, Courneau, Courtis, Couturier, Cramahe, Crosslye.

Dabbiac, Darques, Dealean, De Bost, De Beaufain, De Bourdeau, De Bordeaux, De Chattinet, D'Elaune, D'Harriette, De Haze, De Jean, De la Bastic, De la Conseillere, De la Motte, De la Pleine, De Liesseline, De Lescure, De Longuemare (alias Aunant), De Lorme, De Lysle, De Richebourg, De Rousserye, De Saussure, De Soirency, De St. Julien, De Targny, Goullard De Varrent, De Veaux, Deyos, Dien, Don, Dondion, Donnerville, Douxsaint, Dozier, Du Bliss, Du Bois, Du Bose, Duc, Dugne, Duplessis, Du Pont, Du Pré, Dupuy or Dupui, Durant, Durouzeaux, Dutarque, Dyzart.

Faucheraud, Faure, Fauton, Fayssoux, Festal, Fillen, Fillieux, Flavell, Fleury, Foissin, Fromeget.

Gabeau, Gaillard, Galliot, Gallopin, Garineau, Garnier, Gautier, Gay, Gendron, Gesque, Gibert, Gignilliat, Gindrat, Girardeau, Girrard, Gobard, Gogue, Gondin, Gourdain, Gont, Gregorie, Griffein, Grimke, Gros, Guerrain, Guerri, Guibal, Guichard, Guignard, Guilheran, Guilladeau, Guillaume, Guiton, Gurillou.

Hentic, Herand, Himeli, Horry, Huger.

Izambert.

Jacob, Janvier, Jeanes, Jeannerette, Jedeau, Joudon, Joulee, Jours, Jorett, Juing.

Labardee, Labrousse, La Coste, La Coulier, Lafaye, Lafitte, Lafons, Lambolt, Lampriere, Langel, Lansac, Lanneau, Lardant, La Riche, La Roche, Lartigue, La Salle, Lassade, Latour, Laurens, Lavilliat, Le Bass, Le Batte, Lebert, Le Brasseur, Le Breton, Le Breun, Le Chantré, Le Clair, Legare, Legendre, Leger, Legrand, Le Jeau, Le Jeune, Lempreur, Le Noble, Lenoir, Lenud, Le Pierre, Lequeux, Le Roux, Le Roy, Lesessne, Le Searurier, Lessade, Lespine, Lestargette, Le Sueur, Levrier, Levvant, Lieubrey, Lifrage, Lineroux (alias "Claremont"), Livron, Lormier, Lovell.

Maillard, Maillet, Mainville, Majinier, Manigault, Marietté, Marion, Marseaux, Martine, Maryllan, Maslet, Mayne, Mayrant, Mazyck, Mellichamp, Mendis, Mercer, Mesmin, Messet, Michand, Michie, Midon, Monke, Montgomery, Moragne, Morboeuf (alias "Labrossc"), Moreau, Moultrie, Mounart, Mounie, Mounier, Mouzon, Mozé.

Neufville, Nicholas ("Petit Bois"), Nicola, Nivran, Normand.

Odingsells, Ogier.

Padon, Parapel, Parisse, Pasquereaux, Pecontall, Pelet, Pepin, Perdriau, Peronneau, Peyrot, Peteneau, Petit, Peyre, Pierredon, Pilott, Piron, Poinsette, Poitevin, Porcher, Postell, Pouderous, Poyas, Priaud, Prioleau, Priolet, Pron, Puchett.

Quanbie, Quintard, Quintyn.

Rapier, Ravenel, Regner, Rembert, Requier, Ribonteau, Rivard, Robert, Rodier, Roger, Rolland, Roquemore, Roujon, Roupell, Royer.

Sabbé, Saquiboville, Satur, Saulnier, Sarineau, Scheurer, Segral, Secare, Seneschaud, Sequin, Seron, Serrazin, Serre, Seveir, Simons, Skrine, Sortie, Soulegre or Solaigre, Strode, Sudré.

Tample, Tarrateau, Tebout, Tetard, Teyssandieu, Thibaut, Thisbon, Thomas, Tisscot, Torquet, Tourron, Tousigere, Tozer, Trapier, Trezevant, Triboudet, Trouchet, Trouillart, Trouilleau.

Vallad, Vallentine, Vanall, Varin, Verditty, Verdiere, Verine, Verre, Vidaut, Vignaud, Villaret, Villepontoux, Vivrau, Voshat.

Total number of names 428.

THE "SOUTH CAROLINA SOCIETY" OF HUGUENOT ORIGIN.

The "South Carolina Society" arose out of the efforts of a few of the members of the French Protestant congregation of Charleston, in 1737, to aid one of their number who was in low circumstances. It increased with such astonishing rapidity that in 1770 it had an invested fund of £52,686 1*s.* 1*d.*, and, in 1777, this sum was increased to £72,530 currency. In 1827, the Society owned property to the value of $156,000, and had afforded education to eleven hundred and seventy children, many of whom it had also clothed. This was in addition to annuities to one hundred and three destitute widows, thirty-four necessitous members, and other charitable work. Although its funds were impaired by the late war, it continues its beneficent mission to the utmost of its ability. The present head of the Society reproduces the name, and the blood, and the ancient Faith of Pastor Prioleau.

HUGUENOT HISTORY.

The Society will learn with pleasure that one of its members, the Rev. Charles W. Baird, D.D., of Rye, N. Y., who for many years has devoted himself to the subject, will soon issue a volume of his History of the Huguenots in America. The new book is promised for October 1st, and will be a History of the Emigration of the Huguenots to America, and of their Settlement in the French Possessions and New England. Although not entitled Volume I., or even Part I., the book is to be followed by a volume on the Huguenot Settlement in the Middle States (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware), and this second volume is to be followed by still another on the Huguenot Settlement in the Southern States (Virginia and South Carolina). It is widely known that Dr. Baird is peculiarly fitted for the production of the foregoing volumes by his spirit of devotion to our Huguenot ancestry, his fine literary taste, his general culture, his discrimination and candor, and his thoroughness in the long and careful study made by him of the Huguenots in America. All who have a worthy pride in a worthy ancestry, therefore; in their fathers, who stood for the truth and a good conscience when such stand meant sacrifice of both fortune and country,—may well thank Dr. Baird

and congratulate each other on these forthcoming volumes. They will serve to supplement the standard volumes on "The Rise of the Huguenots of France," by Dr. Baird's justly distinguished brother, Professor Henry M. Baird. There is no higher authority on these themes of surpassing interest than these erudite brothers.

AN APPEAL FOR FRANCE.

The directors of the American and Foreign Christian Union ask a hearing from the descendants of the Huguenots in America for a few words on behalf of the evangelization of France.

Under the guidance, as we trust, of the Master himself, the work of the Union, for the present, has been consecrated to the European field, and especially to France. The scattered mission work in this country has been suspended; the Board of Directors has been reduced, in the interest of efficiency, from forty to scarce more than one third of that number; in every department earnest effort has been made to join economy with thorough effectiveness. We submit the following facts:

I. The conversion of France to the evangelical faith is a work of the utmost importance. The plea for France does not rest simply on its census of 37,000,000 of souls. France has rank and power. It is in the van of the world's march. It holds the destinies of other nations linked with its own. Its scholars, philosophers, and statesmen give counsel to men of thought and to men of affairs in other nations. In the conflict between evangelical religion and the allied forces of superstition and infidelity, France cannot stand neutral. From her relations to other nations, and still more because of the ardent enthusiasm of her own mind, she must have a large part in the struggle.

II. The present time is a time of special peril. With a population nominally papal, the traditional faith of France is losing its power over the souls of men with wonderful rapidity. On the one hand the number of the Roman Catholic clergy is rapidly declining; on the other the number of the free-thinkers is rapidly increasing. The new maxims of the Republic proclaim liberty of thought. Avowed hostility to Rome is encouraged. In the name of patriotism leading statesmen renounce religion. For the great multitude in France the only alternative is Romanism or infidelity. France is doomed to become atheistic, unless a true gospel shall come to her people. If France becomes atheistic the infection will extend to our own people, as it has heretofore. Our Christian patriotism indorses the appeal for France.

III. But the present is a time of special promise. The word of God is not bound. The spirit of religious freedom that pervades the nation, the steadfast, patient zeal of the Protestant Christians of France, and the natural recoil from a false faith, have combined to secure for France absolute religious freedom. Both among the rulers and the people good-will toward Christianity prevails. A considerable proportion of the Deputies and Senators are already Protestants. Eager crowds gather to hear the Gospel, as new to them as though they had never heard of Him who gave it. Multitudes are on the alert, glad to welcome a truth that will save them from the abyss of infidelity. To preach the Gospel to such men is like carrying food to those who have long suffered the pangs of hunger, who have spent their money for that which is not bread. Does not this state of things in France fully justify the new departure of this Society?

IV. The churches have wisely abstained from denominational missions to the French. The *Missionary Herald*, of February, 1881, rightly estimates the conditions of most

effective evangelization when it says: "The great work is to be done by Protestants in France through their own local organizations."

V. The American and Foreign Christian Union conducts its work in the name of our common evangelical Christianity. It works in co-operation with the existing evangelical missionary societies of France, and in counsel with them. It is the Society to which chiefly the earnest appeals of the Christian Protestants of France are directed. For intelligent methods of approach to the French mind, for the amount of evangelistic work done in comparison with its pecuniary cost, the missionary organizations of the French churches enjoy an immense advantage over any other agencies that we could employ.

Happily the Rev. R. W. McAll, with his associates in the noble mission that bears his name, has gained access to the hearts of many in our churches. No man more earnestly than he, and none more intelligently, pleads the cause that we would aid. The very interest that has been aroused in his mission stirs his solicitude, lest, in devotion to his work, we forget the three chief Societies established by the French churches, and for the churches. If our interest in his work should withdraw interest from their work, it would be a calamity to both.

For France as a nation — that fills a large place in the current religious history of the world, and exerts a larger power than many nations united, but which is in great need— we appeal to the churches and to individual Christians.

The Corresponding Secretary of the American and Foreign Christian Union, Rev. George B. Safford, D.D., room 43, Bible House, will address churches that may wish to hear more particular statements relating to the French work. The *Christian World* will specially devote its pages to reports from France.

On behalf of the Union we earnestly ask a place among the objects to which the Huguenot descendants and the churches regularly contribute, and to which men, glad to enlarge their share in the building of the Lord's kingdom, freely give.

WM. M. TAYLOR,
S. I. PRIME,
O. H. TIFFANY,
W. T. SABINE,
L. T. CHAMBERLAIN,
HENRY TALMADGE,
H. C. HOUGHTON,
E. B. COE,
A. V. WITTMEYER,
E. S. WEST,
J. W. COOPER,
FRANK A. FERRIS,
WM. IVES WASHBURN,
Directors.

VOL. 1. NO. 2.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Huguenot Society of America.

JUNE 2ND, 1884, TO APRIL 20TH, 1888.



Printed for the Society by authority of the Executive Committee.

NEW YORK, JULY, 1889.

The Huguenot Society of America was organized in May, 1883. Since that time it has issued the following publications:

The Articles of Incorporation Constitution and By-Laws of the Society, together with a list of its members;

The First Volume of its Collections. being the records of the French Huguenot Church in the City of New York;

The Proceedings leading to, and on the occasion of, the Bi-Centenary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, October 22d, 1885; and

The first number of the Proceedings of the Society, which cover the period from its organization to and including the Public Meeting on the 24th of April, 1884.

The present number is intended to present in an accessible form to all the members of the Society, an abstract of its proceedings since that date, to and including April 20th, 1888; and inasmuch as large powers have from time to time been delegated by the Society to the Executive Committee, and as many matters of general interest have been transacted by that Committee, it was deemed best to include in this publication the more important of its acts.

As soon as possible after the publication of this number, the Proceedings for the year 1888-'89 will follow, including the valuable paper of Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., on the Edict of Nantes, the President's Address, Nov. 15th, 1888, Edward de Lancey, Esq's. paper on Philip Freneau, and abstracts of others of great interest, but which their authors do not desire to be published in full.

Through inadvertence the first number published had no proper title page. To remedy this, one will be prepared and affixed to this number, and when bound it may be placed in front of the first.

H. W. BOOKSTAVER,
CHARLES A. BRIGGS,
PETER B. OLNEY,
Committee on Publication.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY AND OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee held at the residence of Hon. John Jay, 191 Second avenue, June 2d, 1884, Hon. John Jay, President, in the Chair:

It was resolved to appoint a Committee to take necessary measures to secure the incorporation of the Society. The Committee was composed of Hon. John Jay, Frederick J. DePeyster, Esq., and Hon. Chauncey M. Depew.

At the same meeting Miss M. H. Maury, Messrs. G. D. Gautier, T. B. Gautier and C. E. Gautier, were unanimously recommended for members of the Society.

At a meeting of the same Committee held at the same place, October 9th, 1884, Hon. John Jay in the Chair:

Mr. de Lancey, Chairman of the Publication Committee, gave an account of the publication during the last summer of the proceedings of the Society, being the first number of such proceedings published. He also submitted two forms for application for membership in the Society, which were approved by the Executive Committee.

The Secretary was requested to prepare a circular to be addressed to the Vice-Presidents of the Society in regard to the establishment of branches or affiliated societies in the various Huguenot centres in this country. He was also authorized to obtain from London copies of the letters from the Huguenot Church in New York to the French Church in London, now in the possession of the latter church.

At the same meeting it was also resolved to obtain for publication the first record book of the French Church at New Paltz, N. Y., and the first Treasurer's book of the French Church of New York City.

The Autumn Meeting of the Society was held in the Young Men's Christian Association Building, corner of 23rd street and Fourth avenue, October 22d, 1884. Hon. John Jay in the Chair.

The Secretary called attention to two resolutions passed at the Anniversary Meeting, the one requesting the President to appoint an Auditing Committee fifteen days before the Anniversary Meeting, as inconsistent with Article IV, Sec. 5, of the Constitution; and the other making it obligatory for the Vice-Presidents to reside in the districts which they represent, as violated by the subsequent election of two Vice-Presidents. On motion, the first resolution was considered and the President appointed an Auditing Committee for the year, consisting of Rev. Ashbel G. Vermilye, D.D., John C. Pumpelly, Esq., and H. de Lancey, Esq.; the second resolution was amended so as to make it obligatory for the Vice-Presidents to reside in the State in which the district they represent is situated.

Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer, acting Librarian, then announced that two important additions had been made to the Library of the Society—namely, an interesting original document of the time of Louis XIV, the gift of Mr. Pierre Lorillard, and four bound volumes of very valuable manuscripts, the gift of Dr. Abram Dubois, and the Society tendered to those gentlemen its thanks for the same.

The following, on the recommendation of the Executive Committee, were then duly elected members of the Society:

Miss M. H. Maury,
Miss Caroline L. Wolfe,
Mrs. M. S. Olney,
Mrs. M. Le Boutillier,
" A. A. L. Metcalf,
Mr. T. B. Gautier,
" George du Bois,
" A. White,
" W. R. Valleau,
" E. Landon,
" D. G. Gautier.
Mr. C. E. Gautier,
" Louis Mesier,
" Banyer Clarkson,
" T. B. Valleau,
" William Ely,
" R. W. Stevenson,
" G. T. Davis,
Right Rev. C. F. Robertson, D.D.,
Prof. Chas. A. Briggs, D.D,
Hon. Peter B. Olney,
Rev. L. W. Eckard.

Thereupon William Ely, Esq., was duly elected Vice-President for Narragansett, R. I.; Henry M. Lester, Esq., Vice-President for New Rochelle, N. Y., for the current year; the Treasurer, Mr. Bartow, and the Secretary, Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer, were made honorary members of the Society.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee held at the residence of the President, 191 Second avenue, December 17th, 1884, Mr. Edward F. de Lancey in the Chair:

It was resolved that the Treasurer, Mr. Bartow, be authorized to communicate with the President or Secretary of the New Oxford Huguenot Society, and to invite them to name one of the members of their Society or some other suitable person, to prepare a historical discourse on the Huguenot settlement of New Oxford, embodying the substance of the addresses made at the recent inauguration of the monument there erected.

At a meeting of the same Committee held at the same place, January 22d, 1885, Hon. John Jay in the Chair:

It was resolved that the Annual Meeting of the Society be held on April 13th, 1885, at the Young Men's Christian Association Building, and that the Rev. David D. Demarest, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary in New Brunswick, N. J., be invited to read a paper on that occasion.

It was also resolved that the Summer Meeting of the Society be held at New Rochelle, N. Y., on the 24th of August, 1885, and that a local committee be appointed to take charge of the same.

It was also resolved that on the occasion of the Bi-Centenary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, October 22d, 1885, the Rev. Henry M. Baird, LL.D., be invited to deliver an oration.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee held at the residence of the President, 191 Second avenue, January 30th, 1885, Hon. John Jay in the Chair:

It was reported that Rev. Henry M. Baird, D.D., had accepted the invitation of the Committee to deliver an oration on the celebration of the Bi-Centenary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

It was resolved that the President appoint a Committee consisting of twenty-five members to make necessary arrangements for a proper celebration of that Bi-Centenary, and the Secretary was requested to communicate with representative Huguenots of the original Huguenot settlements for the purpose of securing their co-operation in the matter.

Mr. Bartow read a letter from the Rev. Mr. Venan, of New Paltz, N. Y., in which he expressed the hope that the Society would obtain possession of certain historical documents now at New Paltz, and Mr. Bartow, Dr. Gautier and Mr. de Lancey, were appointed a Committee to enquire into the matter.

At a meeting of the same Committee, held at the same place, February 13th, 1885, Hon. John Jay, President, in the Chair:

Mr. DePeyster, on behalf of the Committee on Incorporation, reported Articles of Incorporation, which after some discussion and

amendment, were adopted, and the Secretary was authorized to have three copies made.

M. le Pasteur Arnaud, President of the Consistory of Crest, Department de la Dorme, France, was elected an honorary member of the Society.

The Secretary was authorized to exchange publications with the Committee of the Walloon Churches in Holland.

At a meeting of the same Committee held at the same place March 26th, 1885, Hon. John Jay in the Chair:

It was resolved to increase the number of proposed incorporators of the Society, and the following gentlemen were added as proposed incorporators: Abram DuBois, William Jay, Pierre Lorillard, Ephraim DuPuy, Louis Mesier, Henry T. Marquand, Peter B. Olney, Walter S. Gurnee, George Quintard, Charles M. Maury, Lawrence Turnure, Thomas Gallaudet and Jacob D. Vermilye.

It was resolved that the Annual Meeting be held in the French Church, du St. Esprit, at which the President and Prof. Demarest were requested to deliver addresses.

The Annual Meeting of the Society was held at the Young Men's Christian Association, corner of Fourth avenue and 23d street, April 13th, 1885, Hon. John Jay in the Chair:

The Treasurer read his Annual Report, from which it appeared that the total receipts of the Society during the year just ended were $854.93, the expenditures $584.87, leaving a balance of $270.06, which added to the surplus of last year made a total of $671.31 then in the Treasury of the Society. From the Report it also appeared that there had been received during the past year for the Publication Fund $80.00, amount previously received $123, making a total of $203.00; of this there had been expended for copying records, stationery, &c., $47.35, leaving a balance of $155.65. The Auditing Committee certified that they had examined the Report and found it correct. On motion the same was then received and ordered on file.

Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer, acting librarian, reported that there had been donated during the year ending this date, nineteen books and eighteen pamphlets, and there had also been received three manuscripts, one of which was comprised in four volumes; that there had been purchased for the library forty-one books; that the Society had continued its subscription for five works in course of publication, and copies had been made of three important manuscripts for the Society. The Report was accepted and ordered on file.

The Secretary on behalf of the Executive Committee then reported the following persons for membership in the Society:

MRS. M. G. BUDD,
" MARTHA J. LAMB,
" SAMUEL E. TURNER,
MR. WILLIAM H. BUDD,
" RICHARD OLNEY,
" H. G. DEFOREST,
" R. W. DEFOREST,
" J. B. LANNEAU,
" GEORGE BOWDOIN,
REV. JOHN H. VINCENT, D.D.,
RIGHT REV. E. DE SCHWINITZ, D.D.
REV. JAMES A. CRAIGHEAD, D.D.,
MRS. C. C. MUNSON,
" C. B. DODD,
MISS CHARLOTTE MOUNT,
REV. JAMES LEFEVRE,
MISS SUSAN MOUNT,
MR. PETER BUTLER,
" WILLIAM E. PELLETREAU,
REV. EUGENE ARNAUD,
GENERAL W. G. DE SAUSSURE,
MR. DANIEL RAVENEL,
" GEORGE LAMB,
" SIGOURNEY BUTLER,
" HOPE BROWN RUSSELL,
" JAMES B. M. POTTER,
MISS MARY E. POTTER,
DR. THOMAS M. POTTER, D.D.,
MRS. A. C. A. ELY,
" CANDACE CARRINGTON,
MR. JOHN WM. AMES,
" CHARLES BERNON ALLEN,
MISS CANDACE ALLEN,

And they were thereupon duly elected members. M. de Richemond, of La Rochelle, France, was elected an honorary member, and Colonel Le Grand Cannon, under a suspension of the rules, was elected an annual member of the Society.

Section 1, Article IV, of the Constitution was so amended as to make the Vice-Presidents of the Society *ex-officio* members of the Executive Committee.

The Society resolved that Professor Elie Charlier, who expected to be in France in October, represent the Society at the approaching commemoration in France of the Two-hundredth Anniversary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

Notice was given that a motion would be made to amend Section 6, Article III, of the Constitution at the next meeting of the Society, by making it read as follows:

"Nominations, together with a written statement of the name, profession and assent of each "candidate, shall be referred to the Executive Committee, who shall pass thereon at a regular meet-"ing of the Committee, and the election shall be by a two-thirds vote of the members present."

It was resolved that the Executive Committee be instructed to revise the Constitution and By-Laws and report at the October business meeting of the Society.

The Society then proceeded to the election of Officers for the year 1885-'86, and the following were elected :

President :
HON. JOHN JAY.

Vice-President for New York :
EDWARD F. DE LANCEY, Esq.

Vice-President for Staten Island, N. Y.:
Hon. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW.

Vice-President for New Rochelle, N. Y. :
HENRY M. LESTER, Esq.

Vice-President for New Paltz, N. Y.:
A. T. CLEARWATER, Esq.

Vice-President for Boston, Mass.:
Hon. ROBERT C. WINTHROP.

Vice-President for New Oxford, Conn.:
ROBERT OLNEY, Esq.

Vice-President for Narragansett, R. I.:
WILLIAM ELY, Esq.

Vice-President for Pennsylvania :
CHARLES N. DU PUY, Esq.

Vice-President for South Carolina :
DANIEL RAVENEL, Esq.

Secretary :
Rev. A. V. WITTMEYER.

Treasurer :
MOREY HALE BARTOW, Esq.

Executive Committee :
JOHN H. GAUTIER, M.D.,
J. C. DE PEYSTER, Esq.,
Rev. B. F. DE COSTA, D.D.,
P. W. GALLAUDET, Esq.,
Rev. ASHBEL VERMILYE, D.D.

Auditing Committee :
WILLIAM H. DE LANCEY, Esq.,
JOHN C. PUMPELLY, Esq.,
Rev. ASHBEL G. VERMILYE, D.D.

Publication and Library Committee :
EDWARD F. DE LANCEY, Esq.,
MOREY H. BARTOW, Esq.,
Rev. B. F. DE COSTA, D.D.

On motion the business meeting of the Society then adjourned, and the Society was addressed by Hon. John Jay, its President, and Rev. David D. Demarest, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J.

Mr. John Jay, the President, on taking the chair said :—

Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the Huguenot Society of America.

We welcome your presence at this our second anniversary. One incident of the occasion perhaps not unworthy of note as indicative of the future of the Huguenot Society of America, is that the Society under the guidance of advisers learned in the law is about to take legal form as a permanent incorporation—and that the Executive Committee are instructed to write its by-laws accordingly. The past year has afforded new proofs from different parts of our common country, of the increasing interest felt in the establishment of this Society to perpetuate the memory and to foster and promote the principles and virtues of the Huguenots. The first thin volume of its proceedings published last year by the Committee on publications, of which an edition of 500 was printed for Charleston, South Carolina, contained addresses of Bishop Quintard, Bishop Potter and of Prof. Baird, of Dr. Vermilye, Dr. Chambers, Dr. A. G. Vermilye and Dr. C. S. Vedder of the Huguenot Church at Charleston, and that publication has served to give both in this country and in Europe a fair idea of the aims of the Society and its wide field of research. It has helped to develop the intelligent and affectionate pride with which our right-minded and thoughtful countrymen cherish the tokens of that heroic race, and to recall the large indebtedness of the Republic to its American children, their services, their principles and their example. It is serving also to revive

the tie of sympathy which still connects the descendants of the Huguenots in the various lands where they sought freedom to worship God, without danger of the Massacres and persecutions, which had driven them from their native France.

Public proceedings during the year in reference to the Huguenots have not been confined to the City or State of New York.

On Thursday, the 2nd of October 1884, an historic Huguenot commemoration was held at the site of the old Huguenot fort in the town of Oxford, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the dedication of a monumental cross of granite with suitable inscriptions in honor of the Huguenots who first settled in that town, and who were driven off by the Indians, with outrage and massacre in 1696. The leader of the band of settlers was a French Protestant pastor, Daniel Bondet, with a company of some thirty Huguenot families newly arrived from France. Some account of the settlers and of the causes which brought to an end the Oxford colony by the savages will be found in the second volume of Prof. Baird's new work on "The Huguenot Emigration to America." The Huguenots were met in the wilds of America by the unceasing and deadly hostility which had driven them from France. "The savage raids from Canada" says Mr. Baird "instigated and sometimes conducted by Jesuit missionaries, continued to disturb the peace of New England;" and when on the 25th Aug. 1696, a band of savages led by Toby the Indian, approached the French houses at New Oxford, we are told that "the Governor of Canada, and his 'cunning men' the Jesuits, have no more trusty and eager servant than Toby the Indian."

At the dedication of the monument, which they prayed might "ever stand as a sacred and perpetual memorial," the opening address was made by Peter Butler, Esquire, of Boston, Vice President of the Oxford Huguenot Memorial Association, and a descendant of Andrew Sigourney, one of the early Oxford settlers. A report on the ancient landmarks and the ground plan of the fort erected by them was made by Mr. Ely, of Providence, and among the speakers were the Hon. John D. Washburne, of Worcester, representing the Massachusetts Historical Society, Rev. Charles W. Baird, D. D., and our treasurer Mr. Morey Hale Bartow, representing the Huguenot Society of America, while among those present were representatives of Historical Societies and citizens of note from other states and towns, as far as Charleston, South Carolina, some of whom traced their descent from the French settlers of Oxford.

The circular of the Huguenot Society of America inviting the commemoration on the 22nd of October, of the 200th Anniversary of the revocation of the edict of Nantes has been responded to with great cordiality by the descendants of the Huguenots of South Carolina. On

the 19th of March the Huguenot Church at Charleston was crowded, and among the families represented were those of "the Manigaults, the Legares of Camden, the Lesesnes, De Saussures, Du Boses, Gaillards, Ravenels, Stevens, Guerards, Mazycks, Bacot, Stoneys, Porchers, Horrys, Hugers, Prioleau, Gourdins, Maynardies, Rutledges, Willis, Cuttinos, Enslows, De Veaux, Thomases, and others."

The presiding officer, the Hon. Rob. N. Gourdin, recalled the righteous Edict of Henry the 4th, in 1598, and its revocation, so brutal, cowardly and politically a blunder, by Louis XIV. misnamed the Great, in 1685. That revocation subjected the adherents of the Reformed Church to persecutions unparalleled in history for their intolerance, fierceness and atrocities, driving the Huguenots from France, and sending many to find homes on our far Atlantic coast ; Mr. Gourdin recalled the fact that their descendants had been illustrious in the history of the State and Country and pointed to the monument in the old Church to Elias Prioleau.

General de Saussure read the circular of the Society and resolutions were adopted, accepting its invitation and appointing two representatives each from the Charleston settlement, the Purysburg and the New Bordeaux settlements. The Charleston meeting before it adjourned took steps for the organization of a Society in Charleston, auxiliary to the Huguenot Society of America. Steps are being taken in other places to form branch Societies, as in Kentucky by the Rev. Dr. E. O. Guerrant of Stirling, a descendant of the Huguenot settlers of South Carolina, and at New Rochelle, New York, by gentlemen of Huguenot descent residing near that ancient settlement.

Some 42 members residing in various parts of the country have been added to the roll of the Society during the last year, some additions have been made to our very slight beginnings of a library which now embraces 103 volumes, 18 pamphlets and 4 bound volumes of MSS. the gift of Dr. Abram Du Bois, containing extracts from the registers of the French Church of London, an original MS. decree of Louis XIV. presented by Mr. Pierre Lorillard relating to the Huguenot Church of Bergersac, France, and copies of some of the original records of Newport, New Rochelle, New Paltz, New York and Manakin Sound, Virginia.

The MSS. for the first volume of the Society's collections including the records of the Huguenot Church of New York, from 1686 to 1804, of baptisms, marriages and deaths of Huguenots, with an index of names and an explanatory introduction is now ready for the press. It is believed that it only requires a well directed effort to enlarge the Society by bringing in the representatives of ancient Huguenot families, and that sufficient subscriptions and historical material will plentifully reward the judicious action of the trustees.

It may be proper before closing this brief glance at the proceedings of the year, and allowing you to listen to the orator of the evening, to allude to the new and interesting work by Dr. Charles W. Baird, the brother of the learned author of the "History of the rise of the Huguenots of France," entitled "The history of the Huguenot emigration to America," in two octavo volumes. Besides the principal movements towards America which took place at the time of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, there were earlier ones of no slight importance. Dr. Baird treats first of the ill-fated attempts of the great Admiral Gaspard de Coligny to plant French colonies in Brazil, and Florida, and then of the emigrations to Acadia, Nova Scotia, Canada, the French West Indies, and of that by the way of Holland to New Netherlands; which has left so deep an impress upon the character and institutions of New York and of the Western States formed upon its model. Dr. Baird has left for further volumes the History of other Huguenot settlements in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware and in Maryland, Virginia and South Carolina.

The materials for this work have been largely found by Dr. Baird during the last ten or twelve years in France and England, in unpublished documents, and MSS. in the hands of descendants of Huguenot refugees, with petitions and other papers on file in public offices, the records of some of the earliest French Churches in America, and of others in England, the letter books of the Venerable Society for the Propogation of the Gospel in foreign parts, in the State paper office of London, and the National archives of France. He has derived assistance from the invaluable series of volumes of the French Protestant Historical Society and of Mr. Bordier, "La France Protestante," and our own governmental volumes on colonial history. The author makes his acknowledgments also for material help to gentlemen interested in the history of the French Protestants at Paris, Leyden, La Rochelle, Geneva, London, Lambeth, and many places in our own land.

These acknowledgments seem to have a value and importance in the assurances which they afford, that late as it may seem for the descendants of the Huguenots to be gathering memorials of their distinguished ancestors, it seems clear that a systematic and well directed effort in this direction will be greeted with the heartiest encouragement and assistance.

I have now Ladies and Gentlemen the pleasure of introducing to you Professor David D. Demarest, D.D., who will read a paper on "The Huguenots on the Hackensack":

Dr. Demarest then spoke as follows:

THE HUGUENOTS ON THE HACKENSACK.

The paper which I propose to read to you this evening will chiefly comprise matters so purely local, that I can scarcely hope to secure the interest of this national society. The actors were men who were not great in either Church or State. Much will necessarily be said about my own ancestor whose name I bear, and perhaps some may consider my narrative more appropriate to a family reunion, than to an annual meeting of the "Huguenot Society of America."

But having been assured that the members of this Society will be glad to hear about the fortunes of any one, even of the smallest and least of the Huguenot colonies in America, I am here to tell you what I know about the Huguenots on the Hackensack, in the Province of New Jersey.

The fact that there ever was a colony of Huguenots on the Hackensack is probably known by very few people, and these few are doubtless indebted for most of their knowledge about it to the admirable history of Harlem, by Mr. James Riker. I gratefully acknowledge my obligations to Mr. Riker for a knowledge of many facts which he has, by his faithful and patient investigations, brought to light. On page 392, of his book, is a very valuable foot note on this colony, containing statements which I have verified by original documents, and to which I have been enabled to add somewhat.*

This little settlement was, so far as I know, the only one looking to organization and permanency that was made by Huguenots in the province of New Jersey, though individual families did locate here and there. The colony was composed of very few families at the beginning, and the number was never increased to any great extent by accessions from without. Very little is to-day known about its origin and history, even in the immediate vicinity of the original settlement, so thoroughly have all traditions about it died out. The French element was so speedily absorbed by the surrounding Dutch, that not a few of the numerous descendants of the Huguenot pioneers, from whom the farms they occupy have come down in unbroken descent through seven or eight generations, verily believe that they are of pure Holland stock, and the story of their French origin is to them a new revelation.

To gather up what may be found of the true and almost romantic history of this little company of 200 years ago, has been with me a labor of love, and a work of absorbing interest. But little would I have found if the men of that day had not kept public records in Church and State, with some measure of care, and if my only resource had been the materials preserved by a pious reverence for ancestry.

*Harlem, its origin and early annals by James Riker, New York, 1881. In the note referred to, there are two mistakes; first, for Essa we should read Essex, (County of Essex): and for Peiret, we should read Daille.

It is even necessary that I should define the geographical position of this colony. Where was it situated? You may have occasion at some time to travel on the New Jersey and New York railway which connects Jersey City and Stony Point on the Hudson, running through the valley of the Hackensack, in Northern New Jersey, and in Rockland county, New York. Twelve miles from Jersey City, on the line of this road, is the ancient and beautiful village of Hackensack. About two miles North of this village is the Cherry Hill station, near to which is a bridge crossing the Hackensack known as the New Bridge, [*] to distinguish it from the Old Bridge which crosses the stream a little more than a mile to the north, at River Edge station. If after leaving Cherry Hill station you look out of your car window, eastward across the river, you will soon see on an eminence, a few rods from the shore, the white marble head-stones that indicate a burial place of the dead. This is what is known in the neighborhood as the old French burial ground, confessedly, one of the oldest cemeteries, if not the oldest in that region of country.

How often have I passed this spot in my boyhood, my home being about three miles to the north of it, and it being quite near to the highway leading to Hackensack, the county seat. And yet, to my shame be it said, I did not know until long after I had reached manhood, why this was called the French burial ground. No one told me the reason, and I had not curiosity enough to enquire. I had a vague notion that either some Frenchman of note had a long time ago been buried there, or that such an one had lived in the neighborhood and given or sold the land for this place of burial. I am, furthermore, ashamed to say that I never entered it until about two years ago. And yet there lies the dust of the principal pioneer Huguenot settlers of that vicinity, and among them of my own ancestors. Not a few of the descendants of the men and women who have been there buried, doubtless pass every day in sight of this cemetery, ignorant of the fact that their French ancestors lie there, ignorant even of the fact that they had French ancestors.

Our surprise at this will, however, be diminished when we consider that these people brought a knowledge of the Dutch language as well as of their native French with them from Europe; that being thrown among the Dutch they were compelled to use their language everywhere, except in their own families; that in the early generations already the Dutch superceded the French in the Huguenot families also, and kept its place from generation to generation until it was in turn pushed out by the English, though to this day retaining a slight foothold in some households in Bergen and adjacent counties. It is, therefore, not so strange after all, that the descendants of the Huguenots should be reckoned by others, and believed by themselves to be Dutch, and should even take pride in their Dutch descent.

Now it was in the neighborhood of this cemetery that David des Marest with his wife, his two sons, Jean and David, with their wives and children, a

*There was no bridge at this spot until about the time of the Revolutionary War.

third unmarried son Samuel, and Jaques La Rou settled in the Spring of 1678, and where they were soon after joined by Nicholas de Veaux, Jean du Rij, (Durie,) Daniel du Voor, Andries Tiebout, Daniel Ribou and others. Who then was this David des Marest, [*] the leader and chief spirit of this colony, and how did he happen to locate in this spot? He was a native of Beauchamp, a little village of Picardy, in France, about 22 miles West of the City of Amienus. He was born about the year 1620. The family of des Marest was very numerous in that part of France, and highly respectable. David des Marest, Sieur le Feret, whose seat was at Oisemont, held many high offices in the State, and he was moreover an influential Elder in the French Protestant Church. His son, Samuel, known in the theological world as Maresius, his name being Latinized after the custom of the times, was Professor of Theology, at Groningen, and a voluminous, controversial writer. His sons, Daniel and Henri, were preachers, and with the aid of their father prepared what has been pronounced the finest edition of the French Bible that has ever been published. How closely the David des Marest, who came to this country, was allied to them is not known. His father's name was Jean, a Protestant Christian, who, with his family, had left his dear native France, like many others, on account of the troubles of the present and the uncertainties of the future, to find peace and freedom of worship among their Dutch neighbors who gave to all such a hearty welcome and secure home. He settled at Middleburg, on the Island of Walcheren Zeeland, at what time we are unable to say. The marriage of his son David and Marie Sohier, daughter of Francois Sohier, from Nieppe, a town of Hainault, 13 miles East from Hazebrook, took place, as the records of the Walloon Church at Middleburg inform us, July 24th, 1643. The des Marest and Sohier families had probably resided in that City for some time when the young people formed this matrimonial connection. Two sons were born to them in Middleburg—Jean, who was baptized April 14th, 1645, and David, who was baptized June 22d, 1649. The latter must have died in childhood, for the name David was given to a third son who was born after the removal of the family from this City.

In the year 1651, David des Marest had removed with his family to Mannheim, on the Rhine, the chief City of the Lower Palatinate. The French Protestants were at this time going from various parts in great numbers to this City, invited and encouraged by the Elector, Charles Lewis, who offered great inducements for them to settle in his dominions. A French Protestant Church was there formed, the Elector himself providing the building. It was called the "Temple of Concord," because Lutherans as well as Calvinists were allowed to use it for public worship. Some of the Huguenots, who afterward came to New Paltz, were connected with this Church. At Mannheim two sons were born to David des Marest, David in 1652 and Samuel in 1656. It is probable that another child was born in the same city,

*His descendants write the name variously as Demarest, Demorest, Demaree, Demaray, &c.

who died in infancy shortly after the arrival of the family in America, for there were four children when the family landed in this country, the youngest of whom was one year old, and we know that of these, only the three eldest, Jean, David and Samuel reached maturity. Another son, Daniel was born in Harlem, N. Y., and baptized in the Dutch Church of New York, July 7th, 1666, who died as the result of an accident when 5½ years of age.

But Mannheim was not to be the permanent home of this family. The Catholic Princes were threatening the Palatinate with hostilities, and many of the Protestant refugees, well knowing the woes that would come upon them if the country should fall into the hands of the deadly enemies of their faith, resolved to leave it. Des Marest and some others determined to emigrate to America. He was in the prime of life, being little more than forty years of age. He felt that at least rest from persecution would be found in the new world, which also gave a better promise than the old for the temporal future of his children and children's children in all their generations.

Several of these families passed down the Rhine to Amsterdam, and sailed thence in the "Bontekoe," spotted or brindled cow, for New Amsterdam, which they reached April 16th, 1663.

Immediately on his arrival, David des Marest with his family joined the Huguenot Colony on Staten Island, a little South of the Narrows. The high esteem in which he was held by the people of the island is evident from the fact that in the following year, 1664, he was chosen as one of the two delegates from Staten Island to the Provincial Assembly of New Netherland, which met to consider the state of the Province just before its surrender to the British.

After a residence of two years on Staten Island, he bought property at New Harlem, and removed thither in the Autumn of 1665. He afterwards added several lots of land to his original purchase, and Harlem was his home during 12½ years.

Mr. Riker has related many of the incidents of his life during those years. He was one of the most prominent citizens of that place, and was deemed worthy of the highest positions which that little community could give him, and seems to have been faithful to every trust. He sometimes had difficulties with his neighbors, and we strongly suspect that he was a man of hasty temper, not disposed to submit meekly to injustice, one who knew his rights and was prepared to maintain them. But the grievance which he seems to have taken most deeply to heart, which was "the last straw on the camel's back," and which confirmed him in the purpose already entertained to leave Harlem, was the outrageous act of assessing him for the payment of his share toward the salary of Henry Jansen Vander Vin, the Dutch Voorleser, and for attempting to collect the money by process of law. On the 6th of March, 1677, the Mayor's Court of New York ordered that the Clerk should have his pay for his past services, and that he should be continued in office and be paid for his future services, and that if any of the inhabitants "should refuse to pay what is due from them for the time past and for the time to come,

then the Constable is hereby ordered to levy the same by distress and sale of the goods for satisfaction of what is or shall hereafter become due to said Clerk."

Claude Delamater and David des Marest, Sr., were the delinquents in this matter, and they were summoned before the Town Court. Delamater stubbornly refused to pay, defying the authorities, and his goods were levied on, but for some reason the matter was not prosecuted any further. Des Marest gave them to understand that he too would hold out, if he were to remain in the place, but since he intended to remove he would pay what was demanded, which he accordingly did.

But why should not Delamater and des Marest have been assessed for the salary of Hendrick Jansen Vander Vin, the Voorleser, and why should they not have paid their shares as well as their neighbors? The plea was (and you will mark the words,) "that they of the *French congregation* in the time of Gov. Francis Lovelace, having received a preacher, the aforesaid Governor had said that the French of the town of New Harlem should be free as to contributing to the Dutch Voorleser." In the Autumn of 1676, des Marest was two years in arrears on this salary account. And thus we learn that there was a French congregation and a French preacher as early as 1674, or nine years before the Rev. Pierre Daille came to minister to the French in New Amsterdam. It also shows the attachment of these people to their mother Church and native tongue. The Dutch language was as familiar to them as the French, but not so dear, and they were ever ready to slip away from it.*

This brings us to the purchase of a tract of land on the Hackensack river in Bergen County, New Jersey, and which was known as the French patent. Des Marest proposed to establish on it a number of families of his countrymen and co-religionists from France, so that they might live in the secure enjoyment of their religious liberty, and at the same time promote their temporal welfare. Having disposed of his property in Harlem, he bought from the Tappan Indians a large tract of land lying between the Hackensack and Hudson rivers. The deed of conveyance bears date June 8, 1677. It was given by Mendawasey, Sachem of Tappan, Jan Claus, Seriockham, Haharios and Kassamen who signed it for themselves, and for other Indians to the number of twenty-six, who are named in the instrument, to Sir George Carteret, Lord Proprietor of the Province of New Jersey on behalf of David des Marest, Sr., and his children on payment of the following articles:

100 fathem of black wampen, 100 bars of lead, 100 fathem of white wampen, 100 knives, 15 fire lock guns, 1 barrel of powder, 15 kettles, 4 barrels of beere, 20 blankets, one saw, 20 match coates, one acker of rum, 20 hatchets, one pistoll, 20 hows, one plaine, 30 pairs of stockings, one great knife, 20 shirts, one carpenter's ax.

This land was conveyed "together with all the woods, underwoods, trees, marshes, meadows, pastures, vynes, minerals, creeks, rivers or rivulets,

*Riker's Harlem.

hawkings, huntings, fishing, and all other the commodities, benefits or improvements that are or shall [be] thereunto belonging and appertaining."*

It is difficult to follow in every particular the description of this tract as given in the deed. The Western and Eastern boundaries cannot be mistaken. The Western was the Hackensack river, the Eastern "a great mountain standing between a great swamp and Hudson's river," which must mean the Palisade range, there being no other mountain or hill of any size between these two rivers. The tract was bounded on the South by lands of Laurence Andriessen or Van Buskirk, and the dividing line was a brook called by the Indians Kessawakey, a little stream running into the Hackensack at New Bridge, and which in documents of a later date is called French Creek. This line running Eastward must have passed not far from Tenafly and struck another stream running Northward called the Gessawacken [Tenakill] and which turning to the West emptied into the Hackensack, "which two creeks," says the deed, "doe encompass the aforesaid tract of land." A few years later in 1683, when David des Marest petitioned the Governor's Council for the privilege of cutting timber on the part of his Indian purchase which had not been patented to him by the proprietors, he represented the tract as two miles in breadth, coming to a point, and six miles in length, which must mean six miles following the river Northward from the mouth of the creek at New Bridge.† On Ratzer's map of New Jersey, made at the time of the final settlement of the boundary line between New York and New Jersey, this part of the Hackensack is called Des Marest's Kill.‡ The number of acres in the tract is not stated, but there must have been several thousand.

About one-half of this tract must have fallen within the province of New York, when, shortly after, the boundary line was run between New York and New Jersey. The boundary between these two provinces was not permanently fixed until the year 1769, but various lines were run at different times, causing considerable confusion in the way of collecting taxes and administering justice.§ Jean des Marest and his brother Samuel and nephew David, in 1704, petitioned Lord Cornbury for an order for a survey of that Northern portion of the Indian purchase which had fallen to New York by the boundary, which, they said, had been recently made, so that it might be secured to them by patent, and they claimed that it embraced about three thousand acres. Against the granting of this petition Capt. John Berry presented a remonstrance, claiming that he had a right to two thousand acres of that Indian purchase, that he had waived his claim on condition that des Marest should bring thirty or forty families from Europe to occupy the lands, that the condition had not been fulfilled, and that he was therefore entitled to two thousand acres of the tract which was claimed by the petitioners.

*For copies of this deed and some other papers I am indebted to the courtesy of C. B. Harvey, Esq., of Jersey City.

†Journal of proceedings of Governor and Council of E. New Jersey, Jersey City, 1872.

‡Smith's History of New Jersey.

§Report of Prof. Geo. H. Cook, State Geologist, N. J., on survey of boundary line, 1874.

The petition and remonstrance were both laid on the table, and whether subsequent action was taken by the Council, I have not been able to learn.*

The Indian deed only extinguished the Indian title. For a good and permanent title, a quit claim deed from the Lords proprietors, successors of Sir George Carteret, became necessary. This does not appear to have been clearly understood at the time, for the des Marests took possession of their lands at once, cleared a tract at Old Bridge, built their log houses and barns, and mill-dam and mills,† and removed their families in the Spring of 1678, before they had any title except that which was conveyed by the Indian deed to Sir George Carteret in their behalf. It is certain that a mill-dam and at least one mill on the Western side of the river existed in 1681, for in that year the Surveyor General, Robert Vauquellen, made a survey for David des Marest, Sr., of sixteen acres lying on the Western side of the river, the Eastern boundary of which is described as the "mill and mill-dam and river." This little tract had been bought, probably near the time of the purchase of the large tract East of the Hackensack, of an Indian Sachem named Mumshaw, whose right to dispose of it was afterward (1684) disputed by another Indian named Korough. How the matter was settled we are not told, but certainly des Marest remained in possession.

At the same time (1681) Vauquellen surveyed various tracts of land for David des Marest, Sr., and his three sons, and Nicholas de Vaux, on the Eastern side of the Hackensack, extending from New Bridge northward considerably beyond Oradell, and Eastward one hundred chains or one mile and a quarter. Probably this survey was not made earlier because of the unsettled condition of the province. Sir George Carteret died in 1679 and by will directed his property to be sold for the benefit of his creditors. Governor Andros of New York then claimed jurisdiction and seized and imprisoned Governor Philip Carteret. In 1681 Governor Andros relinquished his claims and Governor Philip Carteret was restored to his position. In 1682 the Duke of York confirmed the sale of the province to the twenty-four proprietors. On the 23d of March, 1682, David des Marest, Sr., petitioned the Council for permission to cut timber for the supply of his saw mill, in the parts of the land he had purchased from the Indians which had not yet been patented. The Council denied his request, but at the same time ordered that patents should be given for the lands that had been surveyed for him and his sons, manifestly referring to the surveys made the year before. The Southernmost portion of this tract beginning at New Bridge and extending Northward was patented to Jean, the eldest son, the Northernmost portion was patented to David, Jr., the second son.

A patent was furthermore granted in 1686 to David des Marest, Sr., for a tract of land embracing two thousand and ten acres, lying between the lands just named and Chesche [Tenakill] Brook, and bounded on the North by lands of the proprietors, and South partly by lands of the proprietors and

*Papers in office of Sec. of State, at Albany.

†Piles belonging to these mills or to the dam have quite recently been sawed off because they obstructed navigation.

partly by lands of Laurence Van Buskirk. The Western boundary of this tract was not, as is commonly supposed, the Hackensack River, but a line running North and South a little to the West of the two Schraalenberg Churches, and which was the Eastern boundary of the lands previously patented. Various claims were afterwards made to various portions of these lands, which the heirs of David des Marest, Sr., were obliged to satisfy. Besides the Berry claim already referred to, were those of William Nicholls and James Bollen. All these lands on the Eastern side of the Hackensack River were embraced in the Indian purchase, but they by no means included all of that purchase.

In 1686, the same year in which the patent for 2010 acres, East of the Hackensack was granted, David des Marest, Sr., his son Jean, Jaques La Rou, Anthony Hendricks, Andries Tiebout, John Du Rij (Durie), Daniel Ribou (Rivers), Albert Saborisco, David Ackerman, Albert Stevense (Voorhees), patented lands on the Western side of the river, extending from the vicinity of New Bridge Northward to Kinderkamack in the neighborhood of the schoolhouse, and Westward two miles to Winocksack (Sprout) Brook and below its mouth to the Saddle River.

The first house in which David des Marest resided after his removal to New Jersey was on the East side of the Hackensack and doubtless very near to his mills at the Old Bridge. He lived on that side of the river until 1686 at least. In that year, the land on the West side adjacent to the mill was patented to him, and the probability is that he at once began to build a house for himself on the rising ground a few rods from the river. He must have removed into it before 1689, for in that year he made his will in which he is described as belonging to Essex County. At that time the Hackensack River was the dividing line between Bergen and Essex Counties. His death took place in Essex County in 1693.

The subject of the Ecclesiastical relations and history of these people is an exceedingly interesting one. They were a religious people, adherents of the Calvinistic faith and ritual and of the Genevan Presbyterial form of Government. They believed in the visible church, and a deprivation of the ordinances of public worship was with them a very serious matter. We have seen that David des Marest was at the time of his marriage in fellowship with the Walloon Church of Middleburg, that he was afterwards active in the formation of a Church of French Refugees at Mannheim, where he was associated with Nicholas De Veaux and others who subsequently came to America, that he connected himself with the Huguenot Church on Staten Island in 1663, and afterwards when he had become a resident of Harlem, with the Dutch Church of New York, though attending French services when they were introduced, in preference to the Dutch. The names of the various members of his family are found on the Baptismal and Marriage Records, and on the Register of Communicants of the ancient Collegiate Dutch Church of New York City. And so we are not surprised to learn that when the family had removed to New Jersey, one of their first concerns was to find

if possible an ecclesiastical home. But there was no church in the whole province nearer to them than the Dutch Church of New York, to which they already belonged. This was nearly twenty miles distant, and the Hudson River was between them and the house of God, and that river was a serious barrier, for there was no steam ferry-boat to carry them over, nor had the horse-boat as yet appeared. No church had as yet been formed at Hackensack nor to the North, at Tappan. At Newark, which was about as far from them as New York, the settlers from New England had the Rev. Abram Pierson for their preacher and conductor of worship according to the Presbyterian order, but as he used the English language he was not competent to edify these Hollandized Frenchmen. Either French or Dutch would have answered, but not English by any means.

About the same distance from them as the church of New York, but without the Hudson river intervening, was that of Bergen, the first Dutch Church established in the province of New Jersey, and at that time the only one. This church had been organized at least as early as 1664, for its registers of baptisms, marriages, admissions of members, and burials have been kept from that date to the present with little interruption. The first house of worship was built in 1680, and was an octagonal stone building situated in the old grave yard West of Bergen avenue, and South of Vroom street. But eighteen years before that time, in December, 1662, the Schout and Schepens of the village had petitioned the Governor-General and Council of New Netherland for a minister, and in connection with their petition they gave the names of twenty-five persons who had subscribed for his support the sum of four hundred and seventeen guilders in seawant. For some reason a minister was not settled among them for the long period of ninety-one years, when, in 1753, Rev. William Jackson was ordained the first pastor.

During the eighteen years that preceded the erection of the first church building the people worshipped in a log school-house which was on the site of the present school-house fronting the square. This was the gathering place for worship for all the people in that region at the time that our Huguenots settled on the Hackensack. The church during its entire pastorless period was supplied at first occasionally by ministers from New York and other parts, but quite early a regular arrangement was made with the ministers of New York to go over at stated times to conduct the worship, preach and administer the Sacraments, and for these services they were paid by the Bergen Church. Rev. Gualterus DuBois went over three times a year for fifty-one years to perform these services. Sometimes a week day was taken for them instead of the Sabbath.*

Very promptly after their removal into New Jersey the seven adult members of the des Marest family and also Jacques La Rou on the 7th day of October, 1678, united by certificate with this pastorless Bergen Church worshipping in the log building. Dom. Wm. Nieuenhuysen, of New York, presided in the meeting of Consistory at the time, and received their certifi-

*Winfield's History of Hudson County, page 378.

cates of church membership, two of which, those of Jacques La Rou, and Samuel des Marest, no doubt came from the French Church in New York.*

I would that I were able to give an authentic account of the church life and church-going habits of these people during their connection with the church of Bergen. Doubtless they were all in attendance on every Communion Day, whether it were the Lord's day or Monday. They would make all their preparations on Saturday, so that they might start early in the morning, for the distance was nearly twenty miles, and the roads were not macadamized, and the wagons were springless, and the farm horses not very fleet. Besides, it was desirable to have, after so long a journey, a half-hour's rest before service for the good of body, mind and soul. The proximity of the inn to the church, customary in those days, was not an unmingled evil. Perhaps, after the services some Van Horn or Van Winkle, or Van Riper, or Van Wagenen or Vreeland, would insist on taking the company home with him to dinner, for nothing pleased the Dutchman of that day so well as to have his table crowded on a Sunday by people whom he respected. Sometimes very little of the day, especially in the Winter, would be left after the close of public worship, for the Communion service occupied hours, and then they would tarry till morning, and on the Monday wend their way homeward. They were not so driven and hurried in their worldly business as men now are. Perhaps, they often brought their lunch with them, and having been refreshed by it, started on their tedious journey for home, which they would not reach until after nightfall. We may well believe, too, that the forests through which they passed in going to and returning from the house of God were made to ring with the Psalms of Marot and Beza.

Are we to suppose that they made this long journey every Lord's day for the purpose of hearing the Voorleser read the Decalogue, and Creed, and a chapter from the Bible and the prayers in the Liturgy, and a sermon from the pen of some famous Holland divine, and to join in the singing of the Psalms in Dutch? It pleases me to think that they did not do this habitually, but that the Senior David was like a patriarch of old, priest in his own household, and that on the Lord's day morning he was wont to call together his children and grand-children and neighbors into his own house, and opening his precious French Bible to read from it in the tongue his mother had taught him at Beauchamp. Then announcing a Psalm from Marot and Beza's version, the men, women and children would unite in its singing with uplifted voices and with all their powers. And then the Creed and prayers would be read from the Liturgy of the French Protestant Church, and perhaps also an instructive and edifying selection from the writings of some Huguenot pastor, who had, with his life in his hand, ministered to some distressed flock of Christ. Nor was the Catechism forgotten or slighted, but its questions would be duly propounded and answered. What emotions must such simple services have awakened in the breasts of the El-

*Their names are on the record of the Dutch Church of New York, with the note "overgeschreeven aen de Franschekke," meaning transferred to the French Church.

ders, and what a powerful and healthful influence must they have exerted on the young people and children! I say again, I would that I knew how it was with them, in those times, for my picture is a purely fancy sketch.

Their connection with the church of Bergen continued about four years, during which they must have helped the Bergen people in building their first church. The last entry of a baptism is dated April 18th, 1682. But during those four years several other entries were made, one of the marriage of Samuel, the youngest son, and Maria Dreuyn, sister of the wife of Jean, the eldest son, and also of the baptisms of two children of Jean, and two of David, Jr. Also, over against the names of Marie Sohier, wife of David, Sr., and Jacomyntie Dreuyn, wife of Jean, is the word *Overleden*, or died, showing that their deaths occurred during that period. And then over against the name of David, Sr., is written the word *Vertrocken*, or removed.

What did that entry mean? Not that he had changed his place of residence, for he never did that after he had fixed it in New Jersey. It meant that he had left, or withdrawn from that particular church. And what did that mean in his case? Could it mean that he had turned back into the world, and away from the visible church altogether? No one knowing his character and history could suppose that for a moment. It could only mean that he had left the Church of Bergen in order to become connected with some other. The word Vertrocken was doubtless placed by his name only, because he was the patriarch and representative of the company, and it was not worth while to repeat that word on the record.

But the question arises, what new Ecclesiastical connection could these Huguenots form in New Jersey? That they did not go back to the Dutch Church in New York is conclusively shown by the records of that church, on which their names do not reappear, nor did they unite with the French Church of that City. It was true in 1682, as it was in 1678, that there was no church in the entire province to which they could go and hear a language familiar to them, except the Dutch Church of Bergen. We can come to only one conclusion, and that is, that they withdrew from the Church of Bergen, to establish an Ecclesiastical home for themselves on their own property on the banks of the Hackensack, in which the French language should he used in the services which were to be conducted in accordance with the ritual of the French Reformed churches. This is confirmed by the concurrent testimony of many facts and circumstances.

It is true, and we must start with the candid admission, that we have no document whatever giving an account of the formation of this church, no book of minutes, no register complete or partial of baptisms, marriages, or admissions to the Lord's Supper. There is a period of fourteen years from 1682 to 1696, during which the Ecclesiastical history of these intensely church-loving people is a perfect blank so far as church records known to us are concerned. Some names of persons on the Bergen record, who were living in 1682, and who then removed, it is not said whither, reappear in 1696 on the record of the Dutch Church of Hackensack, which had been formed in 1686.

Now what shall we, in the absence of church records say about their Ecclesiastical history during these fourteen years? There were, during these years, some marriages among the young people; four at least we are certain of among the des Marests alone, and births of at least fourteen children of the same name, and we may be sure that every one of these marriages was solemnized by a Christian minister, and that every child born was baptized. Now, who performed these marriage ceremonies, and who administered these baptisms, and where were they recorded? Not a church record in New York or New Jersey, containing them, can be found. Can we doubt that a French Huguenot minister performed these ceremonies right there on the banks of the Hackensack?

It is not supposed by any one that this little church ever had a pastor of its own, but that it was occasionally visited by the French ministers from New York, and especially by the Rev. Pierre Daille, whose special mission seems to have been to look after the various French settlements in the province, for the promotion of their spiritual welfare. It is a very significant fact that the withdrawal of the Huguenots from the Church of Bergen took place probably in the same year in which Daille came to minister to the French in New York City, and in which he began to search out, and to care for the scattered flocks of his countrymen and co-religionists. What is more likely than that these Huguenots on the Hackensack should have asked for, and received a share of these ministrations? An interesting fact connects Mr. Daille with these people. Some days after the death of David des Marest, Sr., which occurred in the Summer of 1693, the two surviving sons, Jean and Samuel, and John Durie, who had married the widow of David, Jr., came together to examine his papers, and to make distribution of the property in accordance with the terms of the will. They came "lovingly and kindly" to an agreement which was put in writing, and the name of the only subscribing witness was that of P. Daille. As the beloved friend and pastor of their father, and theirs also, he had been invited to be with them on this occasion. He was doubtless on familiar ground, and in a house whose hospitality he had often enjoyed in his visits to the little flock on the Hackensack, who revered him as their spiritual father and guide.

It is moreover quite certain that they had a house of worship close by the cemetery to which we have referred. Those who in former years had charge of this cemetery have affirmed that in digging graves they have come to stones which had evidently belonged to the foundations of a building. Now what building could have been standing there in the midst of the graves but a house of worship? Tradition also says that they had a French school, a parochial school for the children, in accordance with the usage of the times.

That a building for public worship should have been provided as soon as the occasional visits of a preacher could be had, is certainly not a strange thing. It was almost necessary, certainly desirable, so that his visits might be made more frequently than they would be if the services were held in a private house. And since it was contemplated to obtain a number of families

from France to occupy the lands bought from the Indians, it was important to be able to offer them the powerful inducement of a house of God prepared to receive them, and in which worship was performed in their own tongue.

The absence of church records is to be deeply regretted, but it is not surprising. What is more easily lost than are documents of this sort, and especially such as pertained to a church which never had a settled pastor, and which existed only fourteen years? Perhaps no record book was ever opened, and the visiting ministers made on loose paper, memoranda of the official acts performed by them. Who can tell what may yet come to light some day in the way of memoranda made by Daille or Peiret? When the church was finally disbanded and they who were members at the time joined the Dutch Church at Hackensack, all official papers should properly have been deposited with the Consistory of the latter church. But, it may not have been done, at any rate, no such papers are in possession of that body at the present time.

Strongly as all these considerations point to the conclusion that these Huguenots had an organized church and a house of worship on the Hackensack, there are facts still to be stated which put the matter beyond all question.

This French Church was established, if at all, about the year 1682 and when as yet, as we have seen, there was no church in the whole region nearer than the one at Bergen. But just four years after this, in 1686, a Dutch Church was formed at Hackensack only three miles distant.* Now if these Huguenots had not had a church of their own and services in their own language, would they not at once have joined this new church which was placed by their door? For four years they had been accustomed to ride nearly twenty miles to attend a Dutch service. Why then did they not connect themselves with this Hackensack Dutch Church, planted close by them, and to which their neighbors belonged? Because, we doubt not, they had provided themselves with a church edifice, and services in their own tongue which they preferred, and probably they had a preacher quite as frequently as the Dutch who had no church edifice, and who were visited at long intervals by the ministers of the word. The records of the Hackensack Church show that for ten years, from 1686 to 1696, only one person bearing a Huguenot name, Abram DeVouw, had united with it. Doubtless the French were accustomed during all those years to meet on every Lord's Day in their own house of worship, and when a minister was present, it was a day of gladness indeed.

But the breaking up and end of this little congregation were at hand. It was obliged to yield to the stern logic of circumstances. The end came in 1696. The patriarch of the colony had died in 1693. His second son, David, Jr., had died before that time. The colony was not increased by accessions of French families, for such accessions were balanced by removals. Rev. Mr. Daille removed in 1696 to Boston. The Dutch people were coming in rapid-

*For an account of the organization and history of this church and a record of its members from the first, see Historical Discourse by Rev. Theodore B. Romeyn, D.D., New York, 1870.

ly and occupying land on every side. Their young men married the Huguenot maidens, and their young women the Huguenot young men. All the young people married, and married early. The Dutch element greatly predominated and the French preachers could not fail to see what must soon take place, and must have felt little encouragement to continue their visits which had been so welcome and precious. Cheerfully, no doubt, did they advise them to cast in their lot with a church so like their own in doctrine, order and ritual, and whose language was not strange to them but in which they had often worshipped in New York and Bergen.

The brave little church was obliged to succumb, and it was swept by the irresistible tide of circumstances into the Dutch Church of Hackensack. The organization perished, but the members joined themselves and became elements of strength to the church then newly-formed, but which has been a noble witness for God through the succeeding generations for 200 years. They joined themselves to these Dutch people, not after they had erected and paid for their church building, that thus without cost to themselves they might enjoy the fruit of the work and self-denial of their neighbors. No, they cast in their lot with them just when they were arising to build, so that they might have the privilege of sharing in the work and the sacrifice. In the walls of that first church building of Hackensack were placed hewn stones, in which were cut the initials of a number of those who were prominent in the work. These stones have been carefully preserved and placed in the walls of every church building subsequently erected by that congregation. They may be seen to-day in the Eastern wall of the "Church on the Green." On one of these stones is engraven the outline of a heart, enclosing the letters D. M. R. (Des Ma Rest) and the date 1696, on another J. D. R. (Jan Du Rij). Another has an inscription which, by a little aid of the imagination, may be pronounced the initials of Jacques La Rou.* These inscriptions show how fully these French families had identified themselves at that time with the Dutch Church, and their recognition at once as important members of it.

And to establish our position in regard to the existence of a French Church beyond all doubt, we turn to the record of communicants of the Church of Hackensack, which has been carefully kept from the time of its organization in 1686. We find on it the following entries:

1696. Op den 5 April met attestatie van de Fransche Gemeente tot ons overgekomden, dese navolgende:

Jacques Larou.
David des Marest, soon van Jan, met zijn vrouw
Antie Slot.
Marritije (Jacobse) Van Winckell, huysvrouw van Jan De Marest.
Mary de Maree, huysvrouw van Jacobus Slot.

1696, den 10 July zijn met attestatie van de Franscheke tot dese ghemeente overgekomden:

Jan de Marest.
Jan DuRij met zijn huysvrouw Rachel Cresson.
David des Marest filius David, ook van weduwe Junior.

*For cuts of these inscriptions see Romeyn's discourse.

Jacob De Groot met zijn huysvrouw
Margrietie Jans.*

In these two detachments eleven members came by certificate from the French Church to the Dutch in 1696. These, doubtless, comprised the entire membership at the time. Indeed the peculiar phraseology of the record indicates that there was a coming over of the whole church. Henceforth for a little while the French Bible was read and the French Psalms were sung in a few families chiefly by the old people. French speedily became a strange tongue to the rising generations.

Did this French Church have a distinctive name or title? We doubt not that it was known in the neighborhood as the French Church simply, for there was no other. It was so designated, we have seen on the record of the Dutch Church of Hackensack. Mr. Riker speaks of it several times as the Church of Kinkachemeck. The authority for this is found in an entry on the marriage record of the Church of Bergen. The marriage of Daniel Du Voor and Engeltie Cornelis was recorded at Bergen, February 28, 1692-3, and it is noted that they had come with testimonials from the French Church at Kinkachemeck, in the County of Bergen. But Kinkachemeck, or Kinderkamack, as the documents of the time usually have it, was then as now the name of the tract lying on the West side of the Hackensack River, and extending two or three miles Northward from Old Bridge. Du Voor went to Bergen from his home at Kinderkamack, and he belonged to the French Church. It was natural that the name of the neighborhood should on the record be joined to the church. It is certain that the church building was on the Eastern side of the river and that Kinderkamack was then as now on the Western side.

Perhaps, in my opening remarks, I spoke too disparagingly of my theme, as being of family rather than general interest. Perhaps the influence of this little colony was far more extensive and permanent than would be thought from a hasty glance at its short history.

Our historians tell us that Northern New Jersey was settled chiefly by the Dutch, and they know nothing of a Huguenot element as a factor of any importance in the population of that part of the State. But suppose that you were to-day to remove from the Northern part of Bergen County, from Passaic County, from parts of Essex, from Rockland and Orange Counties, New York, all who bear the names of the original Huguenot settlers on the Hackensack, and of those who soon after located in their neighborhood as Terheuns, Loziers, DeMotts, Debauns, Ferdons, etc., you would vacate a very

*Translation.—On the 5th of April, 1696, by certificate from the French Church the following who have come over to us.
Jacques La Rou.
David des Marest, son of John, with his wife
Antie Slot.
Marritije (Jacobse) Van Winckell, wife of John De Marest.
Mary de Maree, wife of Jacobus Slot.
On the 10th of July, 1696, by certificate from the French Church there have come over to us:
John De Marest.
John DuRij (Durie) with his wife Rachel Cresson.
David des Marest, son of David, also of the widow of Junior,
Jacob DeGroot with his wife
Margrietie Jans.

large proportion of the houses and farms in that extensive district. And if, in addition you were to remove all, who though bearing Dutch names, have quite as much of French as of Dutch blood in their veins, you would create a wilderness almost without inhabitants, for you would carry away the Voorheeses, Bantas, Brinkerhoffs, Blauvelts, Van Wagenens, Bogerts, Van Buskirks, Ackermans, Hoppers, about all of them.

This little colony was a permanent one. The French language passed away and the French Church was absorbed by the Dutch. The plans of David des Marest in regard to the enlargement of the colony failed, but he and his three sons came to stay, and they planned for homes for their children and children's children. Their work was never destroyed, nor were their plans interfered with by hostile savages. They held what they had obtained at the beginning and constantly added to their possessions. The three brothers, Jean, David and Samuel, had an aggregate of thirty-four children, thirty of whom, twelve sons and eighteen daughters, married and became fathers and mothers of families which were for the most part entitled to the Old Testament benediction. The two thousand acres of the patent of 1686, as well as the lands previously secured, were speedily occupied, and to these were added tract after tract to the North and West, extending into Rockland and Orange Counties, New York, and what is now Passaic in New Jersey. Before the Revolutionary War some of the family emigrated to Adams County, Pennsylvania, joining the Conewago settlement near Gettysburg. One of these emigrants, Samuel, moved thence to Harrod's Station, Kentucky, and a considerable number of his descendants are to be found in that State. Some went from Conewago to Western New York, where many of their descendants still have their homes. One, Guillaume, who was a Loyalist, went to Canada after the Revolutionary War, and on lands granted him by the Crown, founded the town of Demorestville, on the Bay of Quinte, Prince Edwards District.

The first movement from the original home at Old Bridge was of course Eastward toward the Hudson, and so lands were cleared and farms occupied at Schraalenberg, Tenafly and Closter, and Northward toward Tappan, and as early as 1724 it was found necessary to establish a church at Schraalenberg for the convenience of the people of that neighborhood who had been accustomed to worship at Hackensack. The names of the original members of this church were to a large extent Huguenot names, and the same thing is true of the second church which was established there in 1756. And if you were to examine the records of those two churches from the dates of their organization down to the present day, you would find in every generation, including the present, a very large proportion of Huguenot names among the baptized, the married and the communicants. And the same is to a great extent true of all the churches in that region.

The religious, moral and social influence of this Huguenot element cannot well be estimated. The descendants of these pioneers, numbering not a few thousands, have as a body been zealous supporters of the church, pure

and temperate in their lives, of integrity unimpeached and honor untarnished, true in all their worldly relations, and patterns of the virtues that adorn the ordinary walks of life, and in a word, good members of the Commonwealth. It has often been remarked by strangers visiting the part of the country occupied by them, that it would be difficult to find a district of the same extent exhibiting more decided proofs of thrift, of general comfort and of contentment, and in which poverty seemed to be unknown.

Surely the province of New Jersey was not damaged by the entrance and settlement within her borders of the HUGUENOTS OF THE HACKENSACK.

APPENDIX.

I

Chronological Table.

1620. David des Marest (son of Jean), born at Beauchamp, in Picardy about this year.

1643. David des Marest and Marie Sohier, were married at Middleburg, Zeeland, (French Church).

1645. Jean, son of David, born at Middleburg.

1652. David, son of David, born at Mannheim.

1656. Samuel, son of David, born at Mannheim.

1663. David des Marest, wife and four children, arrived at New Amsterdam, in the Bontekoe, and settled on Staten Island.

1665. The family removed to New Harlem.

1677. June 8th. Tappan Indians convey lands on the Hackensack to David des Marest.

1678. The des Marest families remove to their lands in New Jersey, and unite with the Dutch Church of Bergen. In the same year probably, sixteen acres lying west of the Hackensack, were purchased from the Indians.

1679. Sir George Carteret died. His property was to be sold for the benefit of his creditors.

1680. Gov. Andros, of New York, claimed jurisdiction over New Jersey, and seized and imprisoned Gov. Philip Carteret.

1681. Gov. P. Carteret restored; surveys of lands made for David des Marest, of 16 acres W. of Hackensack river, and of various tracts on the Eastern side for himself, his sons and Nicholas De Veaux.

1682. March 14th. The Duke of York confirms the sale of the Province to the 24 Proprietors. Probably in this year the Hackensack Huguenots withdrew from the Dutch Church of Bergen, and built a church for themselves, and held services in French, enjoying occasionally the visits of Huguenot preachers from New York City.

1686. The lands on the West of the Hackensack from New Bridge to Kinderkamack, surveyed for various parties. Also on the East of the River, 2010 acres patented to David des Marest, Sr., extending eastward to the Tenakill.

1689. David des Marest, Sr., makes his Will, in which he declares himself of the County of Essex, showing that he must have removed across the river after the year 1686, for the deed given him that year represents him as a citizen of Bergen County.

1693. David des Marest, Sr., died. Oct. 16th the heirs made a division of the property.

1696. The members of the French Church joined the Dutch Church of Hackensack. In this year the Dutch congregation built its house of worship.

1704. The petition of the sons of David, Sr., to Lord Cornbury, for a survey of lands. Capt. John Berry's remonstrance and claim.

1719. Jean des Marest died.

1724. A Dutch Church organized at Schraalenberg.

1728. Samuel des Marest died.

1756. Second Church of Schraalenberg (North) formed.

II

The First Three Generations of the des Marest Family in this Country.

FIRST GENERATION.

David, son of Jean des Marest, was born at Beauchamp, in Picardy, about the year 1620.

Marie, daughter of Francois Sohier, was born in Nieppe, a town of Hainault. They were married at Middleburg, on the island of Zeeland, July 24th, 1643. Their children were:

SECOND GENERATION.

1. Jean, baptized at Middleburg, in the French Church, April 14th, 1645. He married, 1st, Jacomina, a daughter of Simon Dreuns, Sept. 9, 1668. 2d, Marritje VanWinckell, widow of Peter Slot, March 23d, 1692. 3d. Magdalen Laurens, widow of Jean Tullier, December 20th, 1702. He died in 1719.
2. David, baptized at Middleburg, in the French Church, June 22, 1649. He died in infancy.
3. David, born at Mannheim, in the Palatinate, in 1652. He married Rachel Cresson, daughter of Pierre Cresson, April 4th, 1675. He died about 1691.
4. Samuel, born at Mannheim, in 1656, married Maria, daughter of Simon Dreuns, August 11th, 1678. He died in 1728.
5. ————, a child is supposed to have been born at Mannheim, in 1662, and to have died in infancy, after the family had arrived in America.
6. Daniel, born at Harlem, baptized in New York, July 7th, 1666, died January 8, 1672.

THIRD GENERATION.

Children of Jean des Marest and Jacomina Dreuns (De Ruine).

1. David, baptized in New York, Aug. 18, 1669, married Antie, daughter of Jan Slot, died before 1706. His widow married Jonathan Hart, of Southold, L. I., Sept. 7, 1706.
2. John, baptized in New York, June 18, 1671, married Debora ———— ——. He removed to Apoughquiminy, Chester Co., Pa.
3. Mary, married, 1. ———— Ely. 2. Jacobus Slot, eldest son of Peter Slot.
4. Sarah, baptized in New York, Oct. 12, 1675, married Abram Canon.
5. Simon, baptized in New York, Nov. 22, 1677. He probably died in infancy.
6. Rachel, mar. Thomas Hyer of Apoughquiminy, May 9, 1702.
7. Jacomina, bap. N. York, April 21, 1680, mar. John Stewart of Stirling, Scotland, March 29, 1700. Removed to Chester Co., Pa.
8. Lea, bap. at Bergen, N. J., April 18, 1682, mar. Abram Brower, eldest son of Peter Brower, March 29th, 1700.
9. Magdalena, mar. James Christie of Iverden, [Aberdeen ?] Scotland, Sept. 8th, 1703.
10. Samuel, bap. at N. York, Nov. 13, 1687. Probably died in infancy.
11. Peter, mar., 1, Marritye Meet, May 14th, 1709.
    2, Maria Batton, Oct. 15, 1721.
    He had seventeen children.

Children of David des Marest, Jr., and Rachel Cresson.

1. David, bap. N. York, Feb. 19, 1666, mar. Sara, daughter of Rev. Guillaume Bertholf, April 24, 1697. He died in 1768.
2. Peter, bap. N. York, April 21, 1677. Probably died in infancy.
3. Susanna, bap. at Bergen, April 7, 1679; mar., 1, Peter Lubbertse Westervelt, April 22, 1704; 2, William Teller.
4. Rachel, bap at Bergen, June 4th, 1680, mar. Andries Janse Van Norden, Aug. 31, 1700. She died before 1710.
5. Jacobus, bap. at Flatbush, L. I., Oct. 30, 1681; mar., 1, Lea, daughter of Peter DeGroot, March 8, 1707; 2, Margrietie Cozine Herring, Sept. 26, 1719.
6. Samuel, mar. Sitsche Siberse Banta, April 21, 1705.
7. Mary; mar. Wiert Banta, April 27, 1706.
8. Daniel, born in 1685; mar. Rebecca, daughter of Peter De Groot, Aug. 2, 1707.
9. Benjamin, mar. Elizabeth, daughter of Peter De Groot, Nov. 7th, 1713.
10. Jacomina, mar. Andries Louwrens Van Boskerk, Nov. 7, 1713.
11. Lea, mar. Rynier Van Houten, Jan. 26th, 1718.
12. Lydia, mar. Stephen Albertse Terheun, Oct. 18th, 1707.

Children of Samuel des Marest and Maria Dreuns (De Ruine).

1. Magdalena, bap. N. York, April 21, 1680, mar. Cornelius Epke Banta Nov. 1, 1699. She died before 1719.
2. David, bap. at Bergen Oct. 3d, 1681, mar. Matie de Baune, daughter of Joost de Baune, Nov. 10, 1705.
3. Samuel, mar. Annatie Van Hoorn, Aug. 1, 1713.
4. Peter, mar. Margrietie Cornelise Herring, Sept. 14, 1717.
5. Jacomina, mar., 1, Samuel Helling (Helm), Nov. 10, 1705; 2, Cornelius Van Hoorn, Jr., July 19. 1710.
6. Judith, mar., 1, Christian de Baune, Jan. 29, 1700; 2, Peter Du Rij (Durie), July 21, 1711.
7. Sarah, bap. at Hackensack, March 7th, 1697, mar. John Westervelt in 1718.
8. Simon, bap. Hackensack, May 21, 1699, mar. Vrouwtie Cornelise Herring, Dec. 1, 1721.
9. Rachel, bap. Hackensack, Jan. 12, 1701, mar. Jacobus Peek, Oct. 14th, 1726.
10. Susanna, bap. Hackensack, April 18, 1703, mar. Benjamin Van Boskerk, March 21, 1725.
11. Daniel, bap. Hackensack, March 25, 1706.

III.

From the Marriage and Baptismal Records of the French Church at Middleburg.

4 JULLET.	1643.
Assistes de Jean de Marets et Francois Sohier, margue de Serville, et Maguerite Sohier.	David de Marets fils de Jean natif de beauchamp et Marie Sohier fille de francois native de Nieppe ft. le 19 Juill Mariee le 24 Jull.

14 AVRIL 1645

Jean des Marets fills de David,
tern : Jean Le Long et francoise Sohier

22 JUIN 1649

David des Marets fills de David, tern : Guintin de Castre, Matthieu Hone... en Ester Carton

---

IV.

Entry in Emigrant's Account Book.

(N. YORK COL. MSS. XIV. 116)

	Debet
David de Maire from Picardie	
for passage and board when he came here on board the Bontekoe, the 16th of April 1663	f. 39
for his wife	39
& 4 Children of 18, 11, 6 and 1 years	97.10
	fl. 175.10

V.

Last Will and Testament of David des Marest, Sr.

In the name of God Amen. Know all men by these presents, That I David Desmarest in the Countie of Essex in New Jersey, Yeoman & Miller considering Mortality of all men, certaintee of death, and the uncertain time, have concluded to make my last will and testament out of the free will and well premeditated. In manner following :

IMPRIMIS : I Recomend my Imortal Soule, when Departed out of my body unto the Merciful hands of God Almighty and my Corps to a Decent & christian burial.

SECONDLY, I make my three sones John, David & Samuell to bee my sole & only Heirs of my whole Estate Reall and personally, moveable and unmoveable, credits and actions none excepted, which I shall leave by decease (except the under mentioned Legacies) for to be Equally Inherited & divided between them without any distinction or prerogative of the one above the other & after my decease to make use of any person or persons whatsoever they paying my Debts first.

THIRDLY, I bequeathe to my maide Anna Counk one hundred acres of land, to be delivered to her by my sayd three sones, to such place as they shall agree Amongst themselves to be delivered to her free and cleare, after my decease, out of my lands.

LASTLY, I make my sayd sones to bee executors of this my Last will & testament that the premises after my decease may be mutually observed and performed Althrough all formalities required by Law, when not herein Expressed.

In testimonie of the truth I have hereunto sett my hand & fixed my Seale 1689 the 26th of August In the City of New Yorke.

David des Marest. L.S.

Paull Richard
Giles Gaudineau
Peter Le Grand
Peter D Lattoy

July 30th 1697. There appeared before mee Paulus Richard and Peter Le Grand & made oathe on the Holy Evangelist of Almightie God that they did see David Desmarest sign & seale the within written Testament and that he did also in theire presence publish and declare the same to bee his last will & Testament

Will: Pinhorne

The same day, appeared before me Giles Gaudineau another witness to the within written Testament and on his Corporall oath did declare that David Desmarest did signe, Seale publish & declare the same to bee his last will & testament.

Will: Pinhorne

To all Christian People, to whome these presents shall come or whome these present Letters testimonial shall or may concerne. The Governour & Proprietors of the Province of East New Jersey Send Greeting:

Know ye that the last will and Testament of David Desmarest late of the Countie of Essex Yeouman & Miller deceased and hereunto annexed was tendered proved, and approved, and the said David Desmarest having whilst hee lived, diverse goods and chattels to be adminis-

tered off within the said Province, and the right of Disposing and granting the administration thereof belonging to us Now Further Know Ye that (Whereas the sayd David Desmarest deceased left his three sons (viz., John, David & Samuel Desmarest, Executors In his last will and Testament and seeing one of them (to-wit) David is since deceased, Wee have & by these presents do admit the administration of all and singular the goods chattels & credits of the said David Desmarest deceased unto John and Samuell Desmarest, two of the Executors in the above Last will & testament therein named truly & faithfully to administer of the same, and a full true & perfect Inventory & appraisement of all and singular the Goods chattels & credits into our Secretaries Office of the sayd Province on or before the Eighteenth day of January next ensuing and also administer thereof according to law and further do make or cause to be made a true and just account of the said administration on or before the thirteenth day of August which shall bee in the yeare of our Lord 1698.

Given under the seale of sayd Province this Eighteenth day of August Anno Dom 1697 in the ninth yeare of the reigne of our Sovereigne Lord William the Third over England &c.

And. Hamilton { Seal of E. Jersey. }

The Executive Committee met at the residence of the President, 191 Second avenue, April 30th, 1885, Hon. John Jay in the Chair.

The Secretary was authorized to print a list of the members of the Society.

At a meeting of the same Committee, held at the same place, May 22d, 1885, the President in the Chair:

A Committee consisting of Messrs. de Lancey, Gallaudet and Bartow, together with the Secretary, Rev. A. V. Wittmeyer, was appointed to perfect a plan for the proper commemoration of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, to be submitted to the Committee, and on motion, the President was added to that Committee. It was resolved that Professor Baird's address, preceded by appropriate religious exercises, be delivered in the afternoon of the 22d of October at 4 o'clock, in the French Church du Ste Esprit. It was further resolved that in the evening at 7:30 o'clock, a dinner be given by the Society, to which the members would have the privilege of inviting their friends on paying for their tickets.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, held at the residence of

the President, 191 Second avenue, June 15th, 1885, Hon. John Jay in the Chair:

The President appointed Messrs. Gallaudet, de Lancey and Bartow a Special Dinner Committee.

At this meeting it was also reported that the Local Committee on Arrangements for the Summer Meeting at New Rochelle, were actively engaged in making preparations for that meeting.

The Summer meeting at New Rochelle on August 24th, 1885, was duly announced by circulars, and ample arrangements were made by the citizens of New Rochelle to entertain the Society and their friends on the occasion. A committee of reception was in waiting at the railroad station on the arrival of trains, to direct members of the Society and others to the place of meeting, and carriages free of expense were provided. Special arrangements were made by the Committee with the New York, New Haven and Hartford R. R. Co. for the running of trains for the accommodation of all the members of the Society and those who desired to attend.

The following ladies and gentlemen composed the Committee of Arrangements at New Rochelle, and its efforts largely contributed to the pleasure of the occasion:

COMMITTEE ON ARRANGEMENTS.

Henry M. Lester,	Mrs. Jos. Lambden,
Rev. Chas. F. Canedy,	" Wm. H. Le Count,
Eugene Lambden,	" Jos. W. Lester,
Geo. T. Davis,	" James W. Todd,
Wm. Le Count,	" H. Hoyt,
Jas. L. Coutant,	" H. M. Le Count,
Geo. Ferguson,	" David F. Davids,
Capt. P. T. LeFevre,	" Jere. Sturges,
L. D. Huntington,	Miss E. Moulton,
R. H. Mullineau,	" S. J. Coutant,
Thos. L. Drake,	" M. J. Bonnett,
A. B. Hudson,	" Lindsley,
Darius A. Seacord,	" Alice Hudson,
John E. Badeau,	" Mary Ross,
Wm. F. Deveau,	" Alice LeFevre.

Proceedings at the first summer meeting of the Huguenot Society of America, held at New Rochelle, New York, August 24th, 1884, the Anniversary of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew;

The meeting was largely attended by members and friends of the Society, and by residents of New Rochelle and vicinity.

Among those present were:

Hon. John Jay, President of the Society; the Rev'd Dr. Charles

S. Vedder, Pastor of the Huguenot Church of Charleston, South Carolina; Morey Hale Bartow, Rev'd C. W. Bolton, Hon. Peter B. Olney, Edward F. de Lancey, Charles M. Du Puy, Henry M. Lester, Rev. A. V. Wittmeyer, William Ely, of Providence, R. I.; Rev. James Le Fevre, of Middlebush, N. Y.; James Wood, President of the Westchester County Historical Society; Rev. Mr. Cobb, of Yonkers; Rev. Henry Meottet, of the Church of the Holy Communion, New York City; Frederick Meottet, Eugene Lambden, Professor Gallaudet, of Washington, D. C.; Henry F. Downe, J. Collins Pumpelly, Prof. David D. Demarest, New Brunswick, N. J.; Dr. William Hague, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. Martha J. Lamb, New York City; George T. Davis, Rev. E. W. Stoddard, D.D.; Rev. John Bayley Hague, Theo. B. Balleau, Jersey City; Ambrose T. Secor, Ridley Park, Pa.; Dr. E. H. M. Snell, New York City; William H. Budd, Henry M. Le Count, Rev. J. G. Van Slyke, and Dr. J. Q. A. Tourtellot, Fall River, Mass.

Regrets were received from:

Hon. Robert Winthrop, of Boston; Miss Wolfe, Newport, R. I.; Mrs. Paren Stevens, Newport, R. I.; Rev. G. L. Demarest, Manchester, N. H.; Charles Bernen Allen, Providence, R. I.; John E. Morris, Hartford, Conn.; Robert W. de Forrest, New York; Prof. Henry M. Baird, Intervale, N. H.; J. D. Washburn, Worcester, Mass.; Edward S. Whelan, Phila., Pa.; Rev. Chas. W. Baird, D.D., Intervale, N. H.; Mrs. Henry G. Russel, Providence, R. I.; H. G. de Forrest, Cold Spring Harbor, N. Y.; S. Butler, Peter Butler and Hon. Samuel A. Green, Boston; Samuel Epes Turner, Wareham, Mass.; Dr. Abram Du Bris, New York; Mr. and Mrs. W. D. Ely and Mrs. Allen, Providence, R. I.; Gen. Wilmot G. De Saussure, Charleston, S. C.; Charles W. Parsons, Princeton, Mass.; Charles Marseilles, Exeter, N. H.; Hon. Amos Perry, Providence, R. I.; Gen. J. Watts de Peyster, Tivoli, N. Y.; Rev. Boyd Vincent, Pittsburg, Pa.; Rev. Thomas E. Vermilye, D.D., Sharon Court; Mr. and Mrs. John H. Badeau, Mahopac Falls; Rev. Joseph DeForrest, St. Louis, Mo.; Mr. Thomas D. Flandreau, Rome, N. Y.

The exercises began at eleven o'clock, at Trinity Church. The services of the Episcopal Church for St. Bartholomew's day were rendered with appropriate impressiveness; the Rector, Rev. Chas. F. Canedy, was assisted by Revs. W. S. Coffey, C. W. Bolton, John Bolton, A. V. Wittmeyer and Rev. Dr. E. D. Flagg.

The following hymn was sung by the choir and congregation:

When, Lord, to this our western land,
Led by thy providential hand,
  Our wandering fathers came,
Their ancient homes, their friends in youth,
Sent forth the heralds of thy truth,
  To keep them in thy name.

Then, through our solitary coast,
The desert features soon were lost;
  Thy temples there arose;
Our shores, as culture made them fair,
Were hallowed by thy rites, by prayer,
  And blossomed as the rose.

And O may we repay this debt
To regions solitary yet
  Within our spreading land.
There, brethren, from our common home,
Still westward, like our fathers, roam;
  Still guided by thy hand.

Saviour we own this debt of love;
O shed thy Spirit from above,
  To move each Christian breast;
Till heralds shall thy truth proclaim,
And temples rise to fix thy name,
  Through all our desert west.

The Rev. C. W. Bolton, as representing the town of New Rochelle, then delivered an address of welcome to the Society, as follows:

ADDRESS OF WELCOME.

"In behalf of the descendants of the Huguenots and other inhabitants of New Rochelle, the honor was devolved upon me of welcoming to our beautiful and historic village the members of the Huguenot Society of America and their numerous friends, who have done us the honor of holding their first summer meeting at the spot which so many of their ancestors chose as their refuge from religious prosecution. And this I do with all my heart, only wishing that it had devolved upon some more gifted speaker. I picture to myself one of those old fashioned, and by no means handsome sailing vessels, freighted with human beings who had in their veins some of the noblest blood of France, and in their souls the love of religious freedom, reflecting the face and temper of their Divine Master. Men that had escaped from persecution not excelled for cruelty, deceit and extent by any other recorded on the pages of history. A persecution in which from thirty to one hundred thousand men, women and children were slain, and endured barbarities unheard of. I fancy some of these men, women and children standing upon the deck and looking upon our rocky shores, as the commander sought a safe landing place, with hearts uplifted in gratitude to their heavenly Father for having brought them to so lovely a home, where they could serve God, with-

out fear, and love one another. Could the providence of God have directed them to a lovelier spot? I trow not. As they glided between our rocky islands, noted for their beauty, and said to resemble in a remarkable manner the Scotch lake made immortal by Scott in his "Lady of the Lake," they must have said "here every prospect pleases and God with lavish kindness has bestowed his gifts," and as they land and plant their feet upon the rocks that forty-sixth Psalm that Luther was so fond of repeating must have been upon their lips.

"God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear, though the earth be removed and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea. Though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountain shake with the swelling thereof. There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God. The holy place of the tabernacles of the most high. God is in the midst of her. She shall not be moved, God shall help her, and that right early. The heathen raged, the kingdoms were moved, he uttered his voice, the earth melted. The Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob, is our refuge. Come behold the works of the Lord and what desolations he hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth. He breaketh the bow and cutteth the spear in sunder. He burneth the chariot in the fire. Be still and know that I am God. I will be exalted among the heathen, I will be exalted in the earth. The Lord of hosts is with us. The God of Jacob is our refuge."

And then with bended knee they thank God and take courage. Their minds referring back to their old dear home from which they had been driven, they said one to another let us call this New Rochelle. I believe this is the only Huguenot settlement that bears a French name. Boston has been called the cradle of liberty, but that was civil liberty. We might call New Rochelle one of the cradles of religious liberty, a far higher honor. You have done well my friends in forming this Huguenot Society of America, it ought to have been done long before. The sons of St. Patrick have formed a St. Patrick Society, and why? because the Saint drove out the snakes from Ireland, and blessed their whiskey. The Dutch have formed a St. Nicholas Society to commemorate the Christmas traveller with his tiny reindeers bestowing gifts on the dear children, who had not forgotten to sweep the chimney and hang up their stockings. The Scotch have formed a St. Andrew's Society, in commemoration of the Saint's kindness to the young maidens, who used to pray to him saying "Oh, St. Andrew take care that I have a good and pious husband, and show me this day who it is that is to marry me," and who taught the young men to be content to live upon oatmeal. The English have formed a St. George's Society to keep in memory his gallant deed of killing the dragon, lest the children should

have been swallowed up to satisfy his appetite. But what are all these to the Huguenot Society of America? This society was founded for the purpose of perpetuating one of the most remarkable events in ecclesiastical history. When France in her madness, and blind to her own interests and instigated by the devil, murdered and drove out the very best element of her land. We are told that 400,000 left her boundaries in the twenty years preceding the revocation of the edict of Nantes in 1685, and 600,000 more left in the twenty years succeeding, making in all one million. These were men of a high, moral and religious principle, had a pure creed, and stood high in the community. They were great respectors of the sabbath. Prof. Baird tells us that they were honest in commercial dealings, truthful, abhorred profanity, or any loose conversation. Their enemies said "the Huguenot never swears."

The name Huguenot was like that of "Christian" given by way of reproach. What it exactly came from learned authors are not fully agreed, but this much we know, that they were first called Huguenots at the city of Tours. It has been asked what have the Huguenots ever done to deserve the notice they seek by this organization. The Rev. Dr. Zabriskie answers it by saying "that this country owes much of its best blood and its noblest history to the Huguenot element of its population, and there is not a protestant country in the world which was not enriched by France's self-inflicted loss." Southey said, "wherever the refugees from France fled a blessing followed them," and Dr. Storrs said, "whenever the history of those who came hither from La Rochelle is fully written, the value and the vigor of the force which they imparted to the early American public life will need no demonstration." Everywhere they brought virtue, intelligence, refinement, and skill and industry, which makes wealth. Everywhere they fought the battles of civil and religious liberty, and were a bulwark against the designs of Rome. I often think what a contrast between them and the Puritans of New England. While the Puritans left their home for religious freedom of worship, they could never allow any one to live in their midst who differed from them in their religious views, while the Huguenots driven out from their homes, despoiled of their property, and barely escaping with their lives, were tolerant and allowed every man to follow the dictates of his own conscience. While the Puritans burnt witches, and drove out the peaceful Quaker, the Huguenots welcomed the Quakers and gave them a home, and by their lives and actions tried to win the erring back to the faith of God. Simple in their faith, simple in their lives they strove to adorn the religion of the Prince of Peace. They did much to shape the character and destiny of this country as a free and protestant nation. Some of our best officers in the Revolution were Huguenots. Many of our best states-

men were Huguenots, and many of our leading professional and commercial men were Huguenots.

It has been said that there are three distinct classes in this country. The English Puritan, stiff, illiberal, domineering, exacting, bigotted, rude and rough in manners as well as intolerant in spirit, killing a cat for catching a mouse on Sunday. The Dutch, lazy, self-indulgent, imperial, haughty, always smoking and flirting with women. And the French Huguenots, polite, truthful, sober, vivacious and strictly moral. Now these three classes first settled this country, and it was the intermixture of these three different bloods that makes the lively, polite, keen, industrious and liberal nation that we are at present. We know not how properly to estimate the value of this French blood in our veins.

No where were the Huguenots more honored or influential we are told than in the city of New York. They contributed a fine and graceful element to the old Knickerbocker Society of Manhattan Island, and their moulding and cultivating influence is seen and felt to this day. But let me say something of this day. We Episcopalians and historians call it St. Bartholomew's day, doubtless identical with Nathaniel of whom the Saviour said: "Behold an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile." Well what happened on this day? Why the horrible massacre of the Huguenots in France. This black deed has handed down the names of Catherine de Medicis and her son Charles the IX to the universal detestation of after ages. France was baptised with the blood of martyrs. One of the first witnesses to the truth of the Gospel in the court of royalty was the celebrated Princess Margaret of Valois, and sister to the then reigning monarch, Francis the first. She is said to have dignified her profession by a pure, religious and blameless life amidst the dissolute and literary household of her royal brother. She selected for her emblem the marigold which in its flower and leaf has the most resemblance to the sun, and turning follows its course. Her device was "I seek not things below," signifying that her actions, thoughts, purposes and desires were directed to that exalted sun namely God.

Now why do we commence this day's meeting of the society in this church? And here comes in a little bit of unpublished history. A year or two ago when the Rev. Dr. Lindsley of this village, was repairing the roof, (I believe of the porch of his present residence) some strange papers were found hid away in this odd place. Of course they must have been Huguenot manuscripts, and relating to very early matters. One paper never fell into his hands, and I hope that I may not be pressed to explain how it came into mine, for it might be difficult. It was a romance all written in French, said to have been found somewhere, I don't say that it was one of those papers. It told of a family of Huguenots who had fled from La Rochelle in France to New

Rochelle in America, in time there were daughters—twins, and as they grew up they were both courted by two rival gentlemen. One an old English Episcopalian who had money sent from his rich relations in England for his support. He could speak French very nicely. The other was a sort of French parson, not as old as his English rival, he called himself reformed, from what it did not exactly state. The young maidens had land, but very little ready money. They of course were blondes, pretty, sprightly, and very coquettish. The oldest (and of course the best daughter) accepted the offer of the English lover, having an eye to his money, as meeting her then present wants. The other sister did not like the match, but was quieted by her marrying the French reformed parson and keeping the old homestead, which shortly afterwards was burnt to the ground. Now from these two religious daughters this town was populated. They have had a few family spats as was to be expected, but still through it all have kept up an old sisterly feeling. This will help to explain the already written and published history and what follows, but we must come back to facts, that which can be proved and is generally accepted. When the Huguenots first commenced their settlement they erected a small church for divine worship. This first church was built a short distance below the one we are in near Stephen Carpenter's barn, unfortunately it was burnt about 1723, here commenced a schism. No, I will not call it a schism but a sisterly separation. They divided, part uniting with the Episcopal church, and the remainder with the French Protestants. The second church formed of Episcopalians was built of stone to our right, close to Miss Moulton's residence. The third was built to our left inside the present church enclosure, this was removed and the present handsome edifice erected. The windows of the chancel contain memorials of the Rev. Daniel Bondet, Pierre Stouppe, and Michael Hondin; these three worthy divines were buried under the old church. The original bell presented by Sir Henry Ashurst of London to the French church Dieu St. Esprit of New York and presented to this church, was loaned by the vestry for some years to the fire department of this village. It has I am glad to say been returned and now stands at the end of the centre aisle of this church. It bears the following inscription: "Samuel Newton made me 1706." The communion plate consists of a large silver chalice and paten, the gift of Queen Anne. The old communion table presented to the old stone church by Aman Guion in 1710 is still preserved in the vestry room.

In the rear of the church across the railroad is the old burying ground where lie, awaiting the resurrection of the just, many of the persecuted and exiled Huguenots. *This much of the elder sister. Now for the younger.* Near the western entrance of the village stands the Presbyterian church in which this afternoon we are to meet and finish our day's enjoyment. A beautiful gothic edifice with tower and spire. Fourteen

years after the separation of the two sisters we find Alexander Allaire conveying a certain lot of land lying in the town of New Rochelle to Isaac Mercier and others for a public assembling place for the worship of God for the French Protestants inhabiting within the town of New Rochelle. In the deed it states that it is for the "sole and proper use, benefit, and behoof for a public assembling place for the worship of God, for the French Protestants inhabiting the town of New Rochelle, who exercise the discipline and church government according to the usages, orders, customs and directions practised, established and exercised in the reformed Protestant churches of the Kingdom of France." This property embraced the site of the present Presbyterian parsonage, the northern part of the lot was formerly used as a grave yard, on this spot they erected a church about 1724. This edifice having fallen into decay was afterwards removed in 1783, this was the second church of the second daughter. No record appears to have been made of the state and progress of this congregation as a distinct body, but upon the 23rd of February, 1808, the Presbyterian church was incorporated under the title of "The French Church of New Rochelle." A reorganization appears to have taken place on the 30th of May, 1812, under the direction of a committee appointed by the Presbytery of New York. This seems to have been a second marriage without a divorce. The church edifice was erected in 1815, and dedicated the same year, on the same spot where the present church now stands, beneath the foundation of the tower was deposited by Dr. Albert Smith the door step of the old Reform French church erected in 1697, the old church was converted into the present parsonage in 1860, and removed directly northwest of the present edifice. Thus much of the second daughter, and this will explain why we occupy both churches this day.

And now after having extended to you a hearty welcome and thanking you for your presence, and having introduced to you the Huguenot twin churches, and given you a slight taste of the treat that awaits you this afternoon, when you will be fed upon some of the fat calf, like that which the Huguenots in the first settlement had to provide for Lord Pell of the manor as an acknowledgment of his rights on the festival of St. John the Baptist. We hope that you will be satisfied that the children of the Huguenots still possess many of the excellent traits of their noble ancestors.

God bless the descendants of the Huguenots and may they return to the simplicity of the faith, to the Sabbath keeping and church attendance of their ancestors, abhorring the oath, despising the dishonesty of the present day, keeping their word, and following the peaceful life and religious character they set to the world, proving the depth and reality of their religion in all the pursuits of this life.

After the benediction had been pronounced the guests adjourned

to the parlors of the Presbyterian church, where a bounteous lunch had been prepared for them by the ladies of the congregation.

After the inner man had been abundantly refreshed the guests were conveyed in carriages and omnibuses to the places of interest which records and traditions associate with the Huguenots. Bonnefoy's Point on Davenport's Neck where the Huguenots first landed was visited. The rude stone which is said to mark the grave of the first Huguenot who died in the colony, elicited much interest and regrets that the authenticity of the tradition is not better established. The old Lawton house, the Davenport house, Samuel David's house, the house where Robert Morris is said to have signed the Declaration of Independence, Rev. Dr. Lindsley's handsome old mansion were visited and the facts and traditions concerning them duly related.

Then the guests and their escorts returned to the Presbyterian church there to continue the exercises.

The Hon. John Jay presided at the afternoon services and made an address as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT, THE HON. JOHN JAY.

Ladies and Gentlemen: I have the honor, on behalf of the Huguenot Society of America, to return our sincere thanks to Mr. Lester and the other citizens of New Rochelle to whom we are indebted for this most kind reception, and for Mr. Bolton's address of welcome, to which we listened this morning with so much of interest. We accepted with pleasure your cordial invitation to meet here on this memorable anniversary of the great crime against the Huguenots of France, which for perfidy, cowardice, cruelty, and horror, has no parallel in the history of Christendom. We all felt that in no part of our broad country could we more fitly recall its solemn memories, and thank God together that amid the wrongs and sufferings of our ancestors, they have left the noble examples of fidelity unto death, which are naturally recalled in this town founded by refugees from La Rochelle, who brought with them the dauntless spirit that has marked the history of that heroic city, and who lovingly gave to their new home in another continent its historic and honored name.

I need scarcely add that your generous hospitality, and the opportunity you have given us, while viewing the advantages and beautiful features of your town, to visit the place where the Huguenots landed on Davenport's Neck, and the still existing memorials of their residence, have been warmly appreciated, and will be long remembered.

The first paper to be read this afternoon by Mr. du Puy will be devoted to "St. Bartholomew's day, its causes and results," and I will now but briefly refer to the subject that I may say a word of the new and most important light recently thrown upon it by the disclosure of the official action and utterance of his Holiness Pope Gregory XIII., as

shown by the original correspondence of the Cardinal Orsini at Rome and the Papal Nuncio Salviati near the King at Paris, and of the Cardinal de Lorraine. These letters dispel at once and forever the doubts that have been raised in regard to the Pope's approval and encouragement of the massacre, by which even some Protestant writers have been beguiled. Our thanks for the disclosure of these conclusive letters are due to that accomplished historical writer Lord Acton, who as you know, is an eminent layman of the Roman Catholic Church, and one who tells the simple truth without fear or favor.

And this trait of the true historian reminds us that among the societies which have sprung into being here and abroad since this Huguenot Society was organized, is the United States Catholic Historical Society, presided over by an eloquent advocate and learned jurist of French descent, aided by able French associates, who will find in the early French missions and the gallant services of the French army and navy, who came to our assistance during the historic war of the Revolution, an ample field for research, rich in material interesting alike to Roman Catholics and Americans.

When the dogma of infallibility was being discussed, as Council of the Vatican was approaching, you will remember the anxiety and disturbed feeling which agitated Europe, inducing even so gentle a divine as Dr. Newman to cry out: "Why should an aggressive and insolent faction be allowed to make the heart of the just sad, whom the Lord hath not made sorrowful?" When that Counsel met, and there had commenced the battle of the Papal and Episcopal principles, there were arrayed against the dogma the ablest prelates of Europe and America; conspicuous among the American Bishops being the late Archbishops Purcell, of Cincinnati; Kenrick of St. Louis; and Conolly, of Halifax. The last-named prelate crowned a powerful argument with the declaration that the proposal laid before them was only fit to be put decorously under ground.

Then came the difficulty—rather an awkward one—from history showing that the lives of some Popes had been unholy, and that the doctrines of others had been condemned as heretical. The method adopted to avoid the difficulty was thus stated by the North British *Review:* "If any fact manifestly contradicts a dogma, that is a warning to science to revise the evidence. There must be some defects in the materials or in method. Pending its discovery, the true believer is constrained humbly, but confidently, to deny the fact."

Archbishop Manning, too, after an attempt to answer the case of Honorius, announced that "in the Divine tradition of the Church all difficulties from human history are excluded."

Cardinal Newman seems to have held on this point a different view; for in his letter to the Duke of Norfolk, after remarking of the Pope, that on the law of conscience and its sacredness are founded his

authority in theory and his power in fact, Dr. Newman added: "Whether this or that particular Pope in this bad world always kept this great truth in view in all he did, it is for history to tell. For a while the papal chair was filled with men who gave themselves up to luxury, security and a pagan kind of Christianity. And we all know what a moral earthquake was its consequence, and how the Church lost thereby, and has lost to this day, one-half of Europe."—p. 77.

Lord Acton, as you will see, has greatly disturbed the application of this ingenious and extraordinary theory of excluding human history when it interferes with the new dogma of papal infallibility, by summoning Pope Gregory himself as a witness to his own part in the massacre of St. Bartholomew.

The outlines of that hideous story are familiar to all of us. "A pagan kind of Christianity" prevailed on the continent. Philip of Spain had ordered the inquisition to be established in Flanders. Sir Thomas Gresham had written that there were 40,000 Protestants who would die rather than that the word of God should be put to silence. The Duke of Alva, in a six years' war of extermination, had sent 18,000 to the scaffold. Catharine de Medicis had contrived the marriage between Henry of Navarre, the head of the Huguenots, and her daughter Margaret, for the 18th August, 1572.

Then came the damnable plot to lure the chiefs of the Huguenots to destruction by a wedding-fete, and to crown the marriage of Henry with the slaughter of his guests; the dastardly shot at Coligny; the treacherous visit of King Charles to the wounded man to express his horror at the act, which he was presently to follow at two o'clock in the morning by the merciless massacre in Paris, which was to be succeeded by a wholesale butchery throughout France. Alva, to whom Catherine wrote the news, is said to have laughed for the first time in his life. Rome was in a fever of delight; a thousand crowns were given to the bearer of the joyful news, the cannon of St. Angelo thundering their delight; then came the papal procession to St. Louis, the sending of Cardinal Orsini to Paris to congratulate the king, the orders for the striking of a papal medal, and the painting of Vasaris' triple frescos; then the subsequent removal and death of the wretched young king, seeing in his last hours his murdered guests by his table and his bed, and haunted by the belief that he was being poisoned by his mother.

The reception by the English Court to the French ambassador, La Motte Fenelon, on his first appearance after the massacre can never be forgotten, when the lords and ladies in waiting received him, wearing deep mourning and in profound silence, not deigning to salute or even to look at him as he stammered out his odious apology to the queen, and retreated from her severe presence, to acknowledge that he blushed to bear the name of Frenchman.

The horror aroused throughout Europe seems to have created a desire on the part of the Courts of France and Rome to minimize the number of the slain, to find apologies for the act, and to escape the responsibility. The lies invented for this purpose were chiefly to the point that the massacre was in self-defense against a Huguenot plot to murder the French Court, and that the Roman Church and Papal See were in no way responsible. The work of romance in this direction has gone so far that it has been boldly asserted in this country, and in our own day, that "the Pope by his words and *his Bulls* publicly showed his horror at such a crime."

Three centuries have passed, and a new importance has been given to the question, for those who accept the dogma of the infallibility of all popes, present and past, and the twenty-third proposition of the Syllabus, which makes it a damnable sin to believe that Roman pontiffs have exceeded the limits of their power, or that they have erred in defining matters of faith and morals.

In 1874 Mr. Gladstone dissected with singular power the Vatican decrees in their bearing on civil allegiance, and showed that she had substituted for the proud boast of *Semper eadem* a policy of violence and change in faith, that she had refurbished and paraded anew every rusty tool she was fondly thought to have disused; that no one could become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another, and that she had equally repudiated modern thought and ancient history.

Among the many replies made to Mr. Gladstone by distinguished Roman Catholics, one from Lord Camoys said: "For myself, I will say that history, common sense, and my early instruction, forbid me to accept the astounding and novel (novel at least in its present promulgation) doctrine of the personal infallibility of the Pope, though limited as asserted to the large domain of faith and morals."

Another from Lord Acton (Nov. 8, 1874), marked by the most striking historic illustrations, seemed to argue that Mr. Gladstone was wrong in attaching so much practical importance to the promulgation of the dogma; that things equally bad if not worse, had often been done by popes and councils and had been treated with contempt by Catholics, laymen and divines, whose assent did not display itself in action. Among his illustrations on this point Lord Acton said: "Now Pius V., the only Pope who had been proclaimed a saint for many centuries, having deprived Elizabeth, commissioned an assassin to take her life; and his next successor" (this was Gregory XIII.) "on learning that the Protestants were being massacred in France, pronounced the action glorious and holy, but comparatively barren of results, and implored the King during two months by his Nuncio and his Legate to carry the work on to the bitter end until every Huguenot had recanted or perished."

The plain statement of facts, where each word had been weighed and had its meaning, called forth marked dissent, and on the 26th of November, 1864, Lord Acton contributed to the London *Times* (sixth page) the proofs of its correctness, in extracts from original letters in French and Italian of the Pope's Nuncio, Salviati, and of the Cardinal Orsini.

These show that the Pope, after being informed by Salviati on the 2d of September that the report that the massacre of August 24, 1592, had been provoked by the detection of a Protestant conspiracy, was an utter falsehood, so far from expressing his horror at the massacre which had occurred, or seeking to prevent its extension, caused the king to be advised by the Nuncio of the desire of his Holiness, "for the great glory of God and the greatest welfare of France to see all the heretics of the kingdom extirpated"—*tous les heretiques extirpees du royaume*, and he advised that the edict of pacification should be revoked. That advice, announced on the 22d September, was followed by Salviati's writing, on the 11th October, that the Holy Father had experienced "an infinite joy and great consolation in learning that his Majesty had commanded me to write that he hoped that in a little while France would have no more Huguenots," *qu'il esperait qu'avant peu la France n'aurait plus de Huguenots*. On the 19th of December Cardinal Orsini, who had been despatched as Legate from Rome, congratulated the King on the glory of the massacre, and "pressed him to renew his promise that not a single Huguenot should be left on the soil of France."

Lord Acton quoted the Egerton MSS. 2077, and in the Paris Library the Italian MSS. 1272, and the *Proces Verbaux des Assemblees du Clerge, I. Appendix* 28, and referred with satisfaction to the fact that among the applauding Cardinals one voice was raised in protest, that of Montalto, who became Sextus V.

It is gratifying to find among the liberal and high-toned Roman Catholic layity such a frank and proper contempt for the Jesuitical treatment of history, and such a manly and scholarly exposure of the pitiful historic inventions, by which it has been attempted to falsify the truth, and to conceal the part borne by the Pope, his legate, and Cardinal in approving and stimulating that infernal massacre.

Of its bloody record in the provinces and the larger cities some particulars, not generally familiar to Americans, have been recently printed by our associate, General de Peyster, who records many honorable names which should never be forgotten, of nobles and high officials who refused to become the instruments or abettors of ecclesiastical and royal murder, and who, in some cases, maintained their honor and their humanity by the penalty of their own lives.

At the conclusion of his address Mr. Jay added: "As you are probably aware, ladies and gentlemen, the organization of the Huguenot

Society of America, has stimulated the establishment of other societies in different parts of the world. An auxiliary society to the American society was formed at Charleston, of which some of the most distinguished descendants of Huguenots in South Carolina are members; this society sends most hearty greetings. The Huguenot Society of London, has recently been formed under very favorable auspices with Sir Henry Layard as its President. They frankly recognize the fact that we have led in the organization of such societies. We have to-day received this cablegram from them:

"AUGUST 24, 7:55 A. M., 1885.

HENRY LESTER, *New Rochelle, N. Y.:*

In spirit we cross the ocean this day to celebrate with you the faith and heroism of our common ancestors.

(Signed,) BROWNING.

Huguenot Society of London."

It is proper to state that the society at its business meeting to-day made Sir Henry Layard and Mr. Browning honorary members of this society, they having paid us a similar compliment. The following gentlemen were also duly elected active members of the society: Thos. W. Bulch, William H. Potter, Gen'l. Elisha Dyer, Jr., Hon. Henry W. Bookstaver, Robert E. Deyo, William A. Du Bois, R. B. Contant. P. S. Mallet, H. S. Rapelyea, William D. Ely, and James B. Contant. The Huguenot Society of America at its business meeting also passed a vote of most cordial thanks to the descendants of distinguished Huguenots at New Rochelle and others for their most kind reception of us to-day."

The Rev. A. V. Wittemeyer moved that a cablegram be sent in answer to that received from the London society. This was unanimously agreed to, and the following was sent:

"AUGUST 24th, 1885.

BROWNING, *French Hospital, London:*

The Huguenot Society of America at its meeting at New Rochelle, has your cordial greeting and thanks God that the bond of Christian Brotherhood defies place and time.

(Signed,) JAY, President."

Mr. Jay then introduced Charles M. Du Puy, who read a paper on "St. Bartholomew's Day, its causes and results." The following is a synopsis of the paper:

MR. DU PUY'S ADDRESS.

Three hundred and thirteen years ago this St. Bartholomew's Day, one of the most atrocious crimes was committed in France that has ever blackened the pages of history.

All Protestant Christendom was frozen with horror by the

slaughter of 70,000 Huguenots, while the Pope in State, offered a solemn "Te Deum" in thankfulness for their deliverance.

A few, weary and foot sore, escaped from the terrors of that day to La Rochelle, where exhausted strength was recruited for further trials which in the end were to scatter the best blood of France throughout the earth.

One of these little companies was planted on this very spot, and in honor of that dear city of refuge of their fathers they called the place New Rochelle. Here old men in sorrowful remembrance and with streaming eyes, have recounted to their children, their fearful trials across the sea, and here they built their homes, some of which are still tenanted by their lineal descendants.

New Rochelle is a fit place for the summer meeting of this society. Its atmosphere is inspiriting and brings to us a flood of remembrance.

At an era when most reformers proclaimed the only road to heaven was by their narrow pathway, it was no small credit to the Huguenot who asserted that all religions must be free. It is still more significant, when in a later age minister, priest or witch, at mens' caprice, by turns were burned at the stake, the Huguenot was never found among the persecutors.

Let us rapidly trace the whole Huguenot movement. Light occasionally glimmered in France, in the dark ages, but often as it appeared, was smothered to death by the Pope's military power.

In 1515 literature was reviving. LeFevre had translated the New Testament, and it was largely read all over France. Rome was aroused and monks went from house to house to suppress the heresy. The Reformation spread rapidly and with equal energy Rome determined to obstruct its progress. A slow fire to burn heretics was the antidote, and it was immediately applied.

After years of terrible persecutions, Protestant Europe was compelled at last to realize that Rome did not intend to reform, and the wicked plots, constantly emanating from and traced to Rome, for the destruction of heretics confirmed this view.

By the marriage of Catherine de Medici, niece of the Pope, to the heir apparent of France, was firmly welded a compact between these two courts which lasted during all her regency of thirty years, to further all schemes for the destruction of Huguenots.

As time rolled on, this powerful Romish organization, irrespective of Popes and Emperors, moved onward for generations to destroy Protestantism; yet, notwithstanding edict after edict was manufactured to oppose and embarrass them, the Huguenots grew more and more in strength and influence.

Quiet occasionally reigned and temporary concessions were made only to provide fuel for fresh persecutions. Then came St. Bartholomew's Day. The King at first denied he had ordered this wholesale

massacre, but later on admitted it. A medal was struck both in France and at Rome to commemorate its importance to the Romish cause.

The horrors of St. Batholomew only stirred the Huguenots to fresh efforts, and their influence placed the Huguenot Henry IV. on the throne. Henry was a politician. He aimed to balance the interests of both parties, in the interest of State prosperity. He granted the celebrated Edict of Nantes, in which they were called the "pretended reformed" religionists. This edict granted religious privileges, but abolished legal political rights. Still he tacitly admitted them political privileges during his reign.

After Henry's death edict after edict narrowed their privileges, and finally abolished their synods which had existed for a century. Blandishments of court favor for the influential and punishment for the rebellious under Louis XIV, did not prevent the Huguenots from becoming more influential. At last, dragoons were ordered to be quartered on families in numbers large enough to consume their substance. Instigated by the Monks, who accompanied them, they went from Province to Province committing excesses so horrible, that when advised of the coming of these "booted missionaries," whole villages would flee, leaving their property and goods at the mercy of these robbers and torturers.

The prisons and galleys overflowed with intended emigrants who under this legal penalty were prohibited from leaving the country. With the flight of 500,000 Huguenots from the effect of these cruelties the industries and resources of France were prostrated. The Huguenots were the sturdy industrial class whose thrift enriched the State. Their departure prevented the rest of the people from providing the means for an extravagant State. This financial embarrassment brought together the State's general which finally drifted into that horrible mob whose enactment outraged civilization. Huguenot integrity and Huguenot industry would have saved the blood stains of 1793 and 94, but the Huguenots had gone! They took with them their arts, their religion and their trained soldiers to reinforce Protestantism everywhere. France, at the behest of Rome, impoverished herself, and to the dismay of Rome the Huguenot reinforced Protestantism throughout Christendom!

The insult to civilization by this hollow mockery of religion, upon the Huguenots, only enforced upon disgusted Frenchmen a nominal Romanism.

The Popes died but this Romish organization persistently carried forward its purpose to uproot the Huguenot for a period of 170 years. This influence has been so strong, that only in 1787, more than a century after the Huguenot expulsion, an edict was permitted to legalize the unmolested practice of Protestant trades and professions.

The papal power should warn us of the danger that lurks in the

influence of unchecked organized corporations. While guarding every encroachment upon freedom, we should avail of every institution and effort that will ennoble humanity and cause this Nation to be a beacon to all the oppressed of the earth!

The Rev. Dr. Charles S. Vedder, of Charleston, S. C, was next introduced and made an impressive address. He recited the simple and touching prayer of the Huguenot sentinels in beleaguered, famine stricken La Rochelle, with telling effect. Mr. Vedder spoke as follows:

ADDRESS OF REV. CHARLES S. VEDDER.

Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, members of the Huguenot Society of America; dear, kind friends and hospital hosts of New Rochelle:

I have no purpose to follow the plans laid out for me upon the programme of to-day, having wearied the Huguenot Society for an hour and a quarter about my own little church, and about the Huguenot settlement in South Carolina, as indicating the spirit with which the people of Charleston enter into this new movement for the revival of Huguenot memories. I will mention an incident which is a little ludicrous and perhaps therefore the more significant and forcible. After the day appointed for our meeting in Charleston for the organization of a Huguenot Society auxiliary to this, one of the wags of our city, a man representing one of the best names in Charleston, came into one of our most crowded and busiest streets, and with a voice full of anxiety, apparently, said: "Send for the Chief of Police! send for the Chief of Police!"

"What is the matter?" the by-standers asked. "Why the Huguenots are rising," he said, and the Huguenots are rising and have been rising ever since, and they have taken hold of this enterprise with intense enthusiasm and interest, and you may count upon them, fellow members and brethren, to manifest the most profound interest in the work of the society and to lend their most earnest co-operation. I do not propose to follow the lines laid down for me in the programme, and speak of the Huguenots of Carolina, but if you will permit me, I wish to indicate if I can some of the impressions made upon me by this meeting and this place.

When the sweet American poetess, Lydia Huntley Sigourney, first visited the remains of the Huguenot settlement at Oxford, Masachusetts, she saw there, covering with its robe of vendure the old ruin, a climbing plant of memorable history, to which she refers in touching words.

That little vine, borne by the exiles in the ship that brought them, and tended with greatest care through all the vicissitudes of their pilgrimage, had a tale for this gentle minstrel, and for all others, as affecting as ever melted human hearts. It told how patient and imperishable was the love of the Huguenot for the land that had cast him

out, and how courageous was the faith that accepted banishment from that land rather than disloyalty to conscience. They who could never again expect to tread the soil more dear to them than all the world else, bore with them something that should remind them of its fruitfulness and beauty, something that should waft to them in a strange clime the breath of home.

It is impossible for one, who visits for the first time as I do to-day this historic and beautiful locality, so dear in its name and in its traditions to all who revere Huguenot memories, it is impossible for such alone not to recall the fact which this incident illustrates. You know that it is said of the first settlers here that one of the most venerable of them began to go down to the coast and looking off in the direction in which he supposed France would be, and offered up his prayers to Heaven. Others joined him in this worship of God and in this remembrance of their native land, mingling the tears of their gratitude for deliverance with tears of grief for the life-long ties which that deliverance had severed, and the same love of country revealed itself in the name by which this settlement is to be forever known. It was natural that the colonists from England and other fatherlands coming out for the most part under favorable auspices, and with the countenance of the mother country, should reproduce in the New World the local nomenclature of the Old World. It was not unnatural even for the settlers of Plymouth Rock, never reserving, never expecting to sever the ties of language, institutions and fundamental principles of religion, which made them one still with those from which they had separated—it was not unnatural that they should reproduce in the New World the endeared local names of the Old. But the Huguenot had been differently treated. His mother had pursued him with implacable and merciless hate, such as was never shown to any foreign foes. He had been denied the right to hope, the right to live, the right of conscience, the right to quiet sepulchres in his own native soil. La Rochelle, the last stronghold of the Huguenots, had been the special object of fierce and vehement hatred. Famine and fire and sword connected themselves with that name. Now, it would not have been strange if the first settlers here had, in the very interests of that religion which demanded resignation, submission and forgiveness, put away from themselves all thoughts associated with memories so bitter, with suffering so unnatural, undeserved, unexampled. But, on the contrary, confronting bravely all provocation to hate in themselves, as they had bravely born all persecution of hate from others, unafraid that love of the country which they had lost would make them miss the sacrifices to which it had given rise, they called their new settlement here after the old Rochelle. Rochelle! the name is talismanic, as sweet in its melody as it is sublime in its memory. It tells of faith and fortitude, so heroic, so enduring, so unquenchable that the heart

thrills, to recall it and forbids the lip power to describe it. The proud record of that last siege of Rochelle has never been, never can be told; sing it as you will, it never can be sung—the story, the glory of the men, who held the town through that long siege, with one spirit pervading boyhood, high and low, young and old, rich and poor, matron and maid—the determination to be faithful unto death for the truth which was dearer to them than life. May we learn from them, friends, the lesson of immovable steadfastness to the truth which they held so dear and made dearer by their sacrifices.

People of Rochelle, of New Rochelle, to you has come a peculiar honor. You may point to homes and hearts and lives that kept pure the faith. Keep green the memory of those who first settled here. Guard well your great heritage. Prize your great patrimony of truth. The world is waking to a recognition of the men of whom in their time it was not worthy. Even the children of the Huguenots are only now beginning to prize a lineage more than royal. You cannot hold it too dear.

Not of the same, but of kindred race, for many years associated with the only distinctive Huguenot Church in this country, I have come to be an enthusiast for the perpetuation of Huguenot memories. Some of my brethren think me too narrow and sensitively jealous with regard to the form of that faith and not content with its substance. If so I must claim your indulgence and claim the right to be proud of the privilege of clinging to form and fact as they unite in the dear church which I serve. It is the one which the Huguenot fathers of Carolina brought with them, under whose shadow they sat with great delight, and which still lives to bear the same fruit for the children, as that which made the fathers true, and strong, and glad, and great.

There is a prayer still preserved, which made part of the liturgy of the La Rochelle Huguenots, which illustrates most beautifully the spirit that animated those heroes. It is the prayer of the sentinels upon the battlements of that beleaguered and famine-stricken town. Permit me to recite it to you. Conceive the scene. The town encompassed on every hand by merciless foes; and within, famine and suffering; the sentinels set out upon the lonely and perilous vigil, after bowing before Heaven in these sublime words of trust:

"O, Lord, God, since it hath pleased thee to establish us upon the watch for the preservation of this place in which are now gathered so great a number of thy faithful servants, vouchsafe to grant us grace that sleep overtake us not; that we be brave and constant to bear and endure, in thy name, for our brethren for whom, as for us, thy son, our saviour died, all work and injury from the weather; esteeming ourselves happy, since in doing so we shall be keeping with thyself the watch of Israel which never slumbers nor wearies in doing good to its

own. But, above all, we pray that we may walk this watch as before thee, who seest all things even to the innermost heart; that in all loyalty and fidelity we may each of us discharge our duty to thee and to thy church, as well as obey the commands which our captain shall give us according to the authority which thou didst give them over us, praying thee also for them that thou wilt grant them wisdom and virtue to lead us well and to command in conformity to thy will, and to the end that we may attain these and all like things. Even as now all things are disappearing, covered by thy darkness which is creeping over thine earth, we beseech thee in thy infinite mercy to cover and conceal our faults and iniquities, freely pardoning them for the name and favor of thy son, Jesus Christ our Lord, through whom alone we ask of thee these and all things which thou knowest to be expedient for the increase of thy reign."

This prayer, followed by the creed and the Lord's prayer, closed with this benediction:

"The love of our good God and Father, and grace, peace and favor of our Lord Jesus Christ, through the communion of the Holy Spirit, rest upon us and upon His Church forever. Amen!

Ex-District Attorney Peter B. Olney, of New York city, then read a paper on the "Huguenot Settlement at Oxford, Mass., its Park, Monument, &c." The following is the

ADDRESS OF THE HON. MR. OLNEY.

The town of Oxford, Worcester County, Massachusetts, is situated some forty-five miles southeasterly from Boston and twelve miles south from the flourishing city of Worcester.

The population of this town numbers about thirty-five hundred souls, and is distributed among some three or four villages and upon the farms in the surrounding country. Its chief industries are manufactures and farming.

The principal village, called Oxford Plain, lies spread out on a plateau a mile or more long, and about a half a mile in breadth.

The main street runs nearly North and South in a straight line for more than a mile. This street is over one hundred feet broad, with footpaths on either hand and long stretches of green sward on either side of the roadway. Along this broad street cluster the homes of the villagers, comfortable houses generally painted white with green blinds, rows of elms, maple and other shade trees in front, with yards adorned with flowers, and shrubbery and gardens in the rear.

On the East and on the West sides of the plain the country rises

into hills, which are dotted here and there with farms interspersed with wood lands.

Two streams wind through the valleys and uniting in the southerly part of the town form the French River, appropriately so named for the first settlers.

The Oxford of the present day, then, presents a charming scene of rural beauty fortunately not altogether rare in the New England country.

But it is not the Oxford of to-day that chiefly demands our interest on this occasion.

The thoughts of the descendants of Huguenots here assembled, fondly turn back to the Oxford of two hundred years ago, and to the little company of French refugees who first effected a settlement in that then wilderness.

So early as the year 1662, when the French king began the system of cruel persecution which culminated in 1685 in the revocation of the edict of Nantes, John Tonton, a Huguenot physician resident in La Rochelle, wrote to the authorities of the Massachusetts Bay Colony describing the sufferings of his persecuted co-religionists and on behalf of himself and many of his townsmen asked the privilege of settling in Massachusetts. The required permission was cheerfully granted.

Again in 1684 in another letter written from La Rochelle the hardships the Rochellese were suffering were again depicted. The writer adds that this country, New England, was held in such high estimation that many Protestants were intending to go to it; and suggests that "the sending over of a ship to transport the French Protestants would be a profitable adventure." Though no ship seems to have been sent from Boston, yet a considerable number of French families, originally refugees from Rochelle and its vicinity, arrived in Boston about the time of the revocation.

In the year 1682, perhaps in anticipation of the arrival of these immigrants, Robert Thompson of London, and Joseph Dudley and William Stoughton, men of note in the Massachusetts colony, obtained a grant of land described as eight miles square in the country of the Nipmug Indians, which tract was afterwards called Oxford, and sometimes New Oxford.

Hitherto from Boston in the spring or summer of 1687 came a company of some eight or ten families of Huguenots under the leadership of Daniel Bondet, their pastor.

In the following year Gabriel Bernon arrived from London, bringing other refugees, who joined their brethren at Oxford.

About a mile to the southeast of Oxford Plain rises a beautiful hill now commanding from its summit an extensive prospect of the neighboring villages and towns for miles around.

Upon this hill, now called Fort Hill, the French settlers built a sub-

stantial fort with bastions, breastworks, ditch and stockade, and down the slope of this hill along the valley of the stream flowing at its base they built their houses, each settler being allotted a farm of fifty to one hundred acres.

A church was also built on the road leading down from the Fort, and near the church was their burying ground.

Two mills, a grist mill and a saw mill, were built on the stream by Gabriel Bernon, the promoter, or as he was called in the quaint language of that day the "undertaker of the plantation."

On the hill around the Fort the French laid out a garden of ten acres in extent in which they planted fruit trees and vines. This garden was for the common use, benefit and enjoyment of the whole settlement.

The grape vines which tradition says were first planted there by the French still grow near the ruins of the Fort.

During the ten years of their permanent occupation of their lands at Oxford it will be seen the Huguenots had done much towards making a permanent and prosperous settlement.

Their great danger was from the Indians.

They were in the country of the Nipmugs, a tribe of Indians the original possessors of the soil.

This tribe had joined King Philip of Mount Hope, in his war against the English settlers, and shared in the disastrous defeat which overwhelmed that brave and able chieftain some twenty years before.

But though their power was broken some of the survivors were bitterly hostile to the settlers and doubtless were incited by the French in Canada and their Indian allies to deeds of violence.

In the summer of the year 1694, a young girl, and two younger children of one of the French settlers, disappeared from the settlement.

After search the dead body of the girl, cruelly murdered, was found in the neighboring forest, and long after, it was learned that the other two children had been kidnapped by a roving band of Indians and carried to Canada.

At last the event occurred which broke up the settlement and drove its inhabitants back to Boston.

On the 25th of August, 1686, a band of hostile savages attacked the house of John Johnson in his absence, killed his three children, his wife escaping by the aid of a relative, and waylaid Johnson and killed him on his return from Woodstock, whither he had gone early in the afternoon of that day.

Two others are sometimes mentioned as victims of this massacre.

This calamity caused wide spread fear and consternation among the settlers and they hastened to abandon their homes and removed to Boston.

Although some of these settlers returned afterwards and resumed

occupation of their lands, the settlement by reason of danger from the savages was finally abandoned by the French in 1705.

A brief sketch of some of the chief men connected with the French settlement at Oxford is not without interest.

As I have said, Gabriel Bernon was the undertaker or capitalist and chief promoter of the settlement.

Bernon was the fourth son of Adri Bernon, a wealthy Protestant merchant of La Rochelle.

The son was actively engaged in a widely extended commercial business in which he was probably connected with his father during his life time, and upon his father's death succeeded him.

He at one time resided at Quebec, carrying on there a large and prosperous business, but was obliged to leave Quebec, because of his Protestantism, and upon his return to his native city of La Rochelle he became a victim to the persecution then raging, and was thrown into prison.

After some months of imprisonment, he was released, probably through the influence of his brothers, who had become Catholics, and escaped to Holland and afterwards was joined by his wife. He succeeded in saving only a portion of his fortune, which for those days was very large.

From Holland Bernon and his family went to London.

From the inception of the enterprise, during its progress, and at all times Bernon was the chief promoter, and active benefactor of the settlement at Oxford, and suffered great pecuniary loss by reason of the failure of the undertaking.

His agent either accompanied the first band of settlers from Boston, or joined them at Oxford soon after their arrival, and acted for Bernon in the expenditure of moneys in necessary improvements; and in the second summer, in the year 1688, Bernon himself arrived in Boston, with a company of forty French refugees, with some of whom he proceeded to the Oxford plantation.

Bernon owned a farm at Oxford of 2500 acres, on which he erected buildings. He furnished the money for the erection of the grist mill and the saw mill and during the second occupation of the settlement by the French he erected there a wash leathern mill.

The home of Bernon after he came to America was for several years in Boston, afterwards in the Narragansett country, and Providence, Rhode Island, where he died in 1736, at the advanced age of ninety-two. Throughout his long life Bernon was conspicuous for his enterprise, energy, high sense of personal honor and his sincere attachment to the Protestant faith.

In his own person he was a distinguished example of the peculiar graces and virtues of the Huguenot character, and his descendants in

the generations which have succeeded him proved themselves worthy of their distinguished ancestor.

Daniel Bondet, the first pastor of the little flock at Oxford, after the first abandonment of the settlement waited in Massachusetts two years, "expecting" as he says "a favorable season for the establishment of affairs, but seeing no appearance and being invited to the province of New York" he repaired to New Rochelle and became pastor of the French congregation in this place.

Bondet's faithfulness, care, and industry, while in Oxford, "both in reference to Christians and Indians, and his unblemished life and conversation" were certified to by Lieutenant Governor Stoughton and Increase Mather of Massachusetts colony.

For more than twenty years Bondet remained the zealous and faithful pastor of the French congregation in New Rochelle. Caleb Heathcote a member of the Council of the Province of New York, in a letter written in 1705 recommending Bondet to "the society for the propagagation of the gospel," styles him "a good man who preaches very intelligibly in English, which he does every third Sunday in his French congregation, when he uses the liturgy of the church" and who "has done a great deal of service since his coming into this country."

Thirty pounds a year were settled on him out of the public revenue, but the writer quaintly adds, "but that is paid with so much uncertainty that he starves under the prospect of it."

In 1709, he with his congregation, became united with the Church of England. Upon his death Bondet bequeathed his library of four hundred volumes to the church.

Andrew Sigourney was a leading member of the Oxford community, the Constable of the French plantation, and the commander of the Fort. Prior to the Revocation, Sigourney was living with his family in comfortable circumstances in La Rochelle.

As a means of conversion or rather persecution a company of the King's dragoons was quartered in Sigourney's house. Having made plans to escape with his family, Sigourney provided a bountiful feast for the soldiers and leaving them in the midst of the feasting and carousing, he managed to escape with his family and part of his property, on board a vessel in waiting, and arrived in London about the year 1681. Afterwards he came to Boston, and thence joined the settlement at Oxford.

Three years after the first abandonment of the Oxford settlement, Sigourney returned to Oxford with others of the French settlers, but on the final desertion of the settlement by the French, returned to Boston, where he died in 1727 at the age of eighty-nine.

Many of his descendants are now living in Boston and vicinity, and have been active and zealous in promotion of the object of the Huguenot Memorial Society of Oxford, uniting with the descendants of Ga-

briel Bernon in the erection of the memorial monument hereafter to be mentioned.

John Bowdoin, one of the Oxford settlers, was the son of Pierre Bowdoin, a refugee from La Rochelle, who was of a very ancient family of that city.

Pierre Bowdoin, after residing some time in Maine, came to Boston, and was a prominent member of the French colony in that place. His grandson, James Bowdoin, became Governor of Massachusetts soon after the Revolution, succeeding John Hancock.

For Governor Bowdoin, Bowdoin College at Brunswick, Maine, was named, and he and his son James were generous benefactors of that institution.

Francis Bureau, another settler, was also from La Rochelle, belonging to a noble family of that city. After leaving Oxford he removed to New York.

His daughter Anne became the wife of Benjamin Faneuil, a prosperous Huguenot merchant of Boston, who afterwards removed to New York, his brother Andrew Faneuil remaining in Boston where he amassed a large fortune. Peter Faneuil, the son of Benjamin Faneuil, and Anne Bureau his wife, succeeded to the business and fortune of his uncle Andrew and became a resident of Boston and one of her wealthiest citizens.

About the middle of the last century Peter Faneuil built a market house with a hall on the second story, which building he presented to the town of Boston. So that Faneuil Hall, known all over the civilized world as "the cradle of liberty," was the gift to the town of Boston of a descendant of a Huguenot refugee.

After the war of the revolution and nearly a hundred years after the abandonment of Oxford by the French, two descendants of Andrew Sigourney returned and became residents of Oxford, where at the present time some of their descendants reside.

In the spring of 1881, certain ladies, residents of Oxford, some of them the descendants of Andrew Sigourney, formed an association, which so early as October 4th, 1881, became an incorporation under the name of the "Huguenot Memorial Society of Oxford."

At the time the society was first formed, correspondence was opened with a descendant of Gabriel Bernon, the Hon. Zachariah Allen, LL. D., a prominent and most highly respected citizen of Providence, R. I.

In May of last year a deed of the ground covered by the Old Huguenot Fort (with a right of way thereto) to George W. Sigourney as trustee, for certain memorial purposes, was obtained by the society, and in June a corner stone was laid near the site of the Fort in anticipation of a monument to be there erected at some future time.

The laying of this corner stone was accompanied by appropriate ceremonies, and an impressive and eloquent address was delivered by Mr. Allen who though at that time over eighty-five years of age, entered into the objects and aims of the society with all the zeal and enthusiasm of an ardent youth, and at all times till his death contributed in every possible way to the success of the society.

The object of the incorporation as stated in its charter is "to perpetuate by all appropriate means the memory of the early Huguenot settlers of Oxford."

As the date of its incorporation was October 4th, 1881, this society is I believe the parent Huguenot Society in America, antedating this organization by some two years.

The first President was the Hon. Zachariah Allen, a great grandson of Gabriel Bernon, and upon Mr. Allen's death in 1882, he was succeeded by its present President, Peter Butler, Esq., of Quincy, Massachusetts, a great, great, great grandson of Andrew Sigourney.

Purchases of lands surrounding the Old Fort have been made till the Huguenot Memorial Society of Oxford now owns, subject to the uses and trusts of the society, about ten acres of land beautifully situated on the brow and slope of Fort Hill. By excavation and removal of the accumulated debris, the foundations and outlines of the fort have been brought to view.

Upon this land, a little to the southwest of the ruins of the fort, the descendants of Gabriel Bernon and of Andrew Sigourney, under the auspices of the society, erected last autumn a beautiful monument of polished granite. On the second of October last this monument was dedicated with fitting and impressive ceremonies to the memory of the Huguenot settlers of Oxford.

The design of this monument is most appropriate: a simple cross surmounting a substantial base of stone, standing altogether some thirteen feet high.

Placed on the top of a commanding hill, and visible for miles around, this cross, the sacred symbol of their religion, will bear witness from generation to generation to the fortitude, the self denial, the fidelity to duty, and the loyalty to conscience of the Huguenot settlers.

The inscriptions on the monument are as follows:

South side: In memory of the Huguenots, exiles for their faith, who made the first settlement of Oxford, 1687. "We live not for ourselves only, but for posterity."

Z. ALLEN.

North side: Erected by descendants of Gabriel Bernon, and Andre Sigournay, 1884, 'A la foi et a l' honneur.

East side: 'A la memoire de Gabriel Bernon Fondatur de la colonize

d' Oxford, ne a La Rochelle, France, 1644, mort a Providence, R. I., 1736, a l' age de 92.

West side: 'A la memoire de Andre Sigournay Commandant du fort ne a la Rochelle, France, 1638, mort a Boston, Mass., 1727, a l' age de 89.

Does any one ask why these tributes of honor and veneration are paid to the memory of these Huguenot refugees, or will any one venture to inquire what is the good or the use of such memorials or what purpose they serve?

To such inquiries we may answer: That men in all ages and in all nations have paid homage to the memories of the heroes of their race and lineage.

These Huguenots were heroes of the highest type. They were worthy compeers of that band of pilgrims who landed on Plymouth Rock that December day two hundred and fifty years ago.

Their age and their country were not worthy of these men.

The memory of their faithless King falsely called the grand monarch by his sycophants and flatterers, has justly become a hissing, a bye-word and a reproach among the nations.

To him the intelligence and virtue of the nineteenth century erect no monuments, but rather with loving reverence they gather to do honor to the memory of his despised and cruelly persecuted subjects.

The Huguenots in France were offered freedom from persecution and immunity from all molestation, and all the consequent advantages and honors in their native land to which their position and character entitled them, if they would abjure their faith.

Some were unable to resist the terrible temptation, but the Huguenots who came to America were made of sterner stuff. To their eyes the path of duty lay plain before them. The voice of conscience was to them the voice of God.

Guided by the clear vision of their divine faith they chose the things spiritual and eternal rather than the things earthly and temporal.

Therefore it was, that they fled from their native land, leaving their property, their homes, and their kindred behind them, they became exiles, and strangers in foreign lands. They braved the dangers of the voyage across the great deep; foregoing the comforts and luxuries of an old civilization, they became pioneers in the wilderness, and endured the hardships and privations of the frontier, exposed to the brutal attacks of the hostile savages; property, rank, ease, comforts, luxuries, home, friends, kindred, country, all these they sacrificed for conscience sake.

The noblest sentiments implanted in human hearts impel us to do honor to the memory of these men.

It is with much gratification that I hear that the men and women of New Rochelle purpose in this beautiful town to provide some fitting memorial in honor of its French settlers.

Your town was named by them for their beloved La Rochelle in France, that famous city, so long a tower of strength and place of refuge for the persecuted Huguenots of all France.

For this, if for no other reason, it is peculiarly appropriate, that New Rochelle in America, should keep forever fresh and green the memories of its Huguenot settlers.

Let your memorial be worthy of the ancient La Rochelle, worthy of your beautiful and prosperous town, and above all worthy of those noble men and women, whose virtues it will be designed to commemorate.

I bid you a hearty God speed in your pious labor of love and reverence.

Rev. C. E. Lindsley, D.D., announced that he preferred to postpone the delivery of an address he had prepared on the "Huguenot settlers of New Rochelle" to a future occasion. This address was afterwards delivered before a large audience of the citizens of New Rochelle, and it is to be hoped that it will be published, as it contained, we understand, many important facts concerning the early settlers of that town.

The Society, before closing the proceedings of the day, adopted the following resolution :

Resolved, That the cordial thanks of this Society be returned to the Huguenots of New Rochelle, and their fellow citizens, for the hearty hospitality which they extended to this Society on the occasion of its first summer meeting.

Thereupon the Summer Meeting of the Society was adjourned.

The Executive Committee met at the residence of the President, 191 Second avenue, October 17th, 1885. Hon. John Jay in the Chair.

The various Committees on the Bi-Centenary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, reported that all the preliminary arrangements had been completed.

It was resolved that complimentary tickets to the dinner be given to all the delegates of the original Huguenot centres not now members of this Society.

On the 22d October, 1885, the Public Meeting of the Society was held in the French Church du St. Esprit, and in the evening the Public Reception was held, and dinner given to the members of the Society.

The proceedings on those occasions having been heretofore published by the Society, and distributed to the members, the same are not here repeated, but those desiring information in regard thereto, are referred to the former publication of this Society on that subject.

Before the Public Meeting a Business Meeting of the Society was held, in the French Church du St. Esprit, at which the following persons were duly elected members of the Society: Mrs. E. F. Allen, Mrs. M. M. Lambden, Mrs. H. C. Lamar Jones, Mrs. A. Guyon. Mrs. F. L. B. Rylance, Miss E. B. Wilmarth, Edward Bayard, M. D., F. E. Flandrau, Hon. D. G. B. Hasbrouck, James W. Quintard, E. R. E. Cowell, Geo. W. Quintard, E. A. Quintard, T. L. Greene. And under a suspension of the rules Hon. R. N. Gourdein, B. T. Rogers, Mrs. M. L. Pumpelly were elected active members of the Society, and Hon. Thomas F. Bayard, M. le Baron F. de Schieklen, and M. Jules Bonnet, were elected honorary members of the Society.

Article IV, Sec. 7, of the Constitution was temporarily suspended, and Hon. Thomas F. Bayard was elected Vice-President of the Society for Delaware.

On motion, the Society then adjourned for the Public Meeting before referred to.

The Executive Committee met at the residence of the President, 191 Second avenue, Nov. 17th 1885, Hon. John Jay in the chair: when it was resolved that the proceedings of the Bi-Centenary Commemoration on October 22nd, 1885, be printed in pamphlet form.

At the same meeting it was also reported that the Society had been duly incorporated, and the Secretary was authorized to obtain from the Secretary of State, a certified copy of the articles of Incorporation.

The President was requested to enter into correspondence with Sir Henry A. Layard, President of the London Huguenot Society, with the view to the adoption of an international badge for the existing Huguenot Societies.

At a meeting of the same Committee held at the same place January 11th, 1886, Hon. John Jay in the chair. The President was authorized to sign his name as President of the Society to the circular containing an appeal for contributions in behalf of the Reformed Churches of France, which cause had before been presented to the Society by Professor Bertrand, and in several letters received by the President, from France.

A copy of a betrothal medal was presented to the Society by S. H. Rodgers, Esq. of South Carolina, which was accepted, and the thanks of the Society were tendered to Mr. Rodgers for his gift.

The Secretary was directed to distribute the forthcoming pamphlet of the Society among the members and to the various officers of the Society, and those who delivered speeches on the occasion of the Bi-Centenary; and in recognition of the hospitality extended to the Society last Summer by the Huguenot descendants and other citizens of New Rochelle, fifty copies of the same were directed to be sent to the

Committee of Arrangements there, for distribution among the citizens of that town.

A Committee consisting of Dr. DeCosta and the Secretary, was appointed to obtain some place for the deposit of the books, pamphlets, manuscripts, &c., of the Society, until some permanent arrangement could be made for the care of the same.

The Executive Committee met at the residence of the President, 191 Second avenue, February 3rd, 1886, Hon. John Jay in the chair.

The Secretary reported that Dr. Abram DuBois had proposed to have the unbound books of the Society, bound at his expense.

The Chair appointed Dr. Vermilye, Mr. DePeyster and the Secretary, a committee to make the necessary preparations for the Annual Meeting of the Society, and it was resolved that Professor Bertrand should be invited to speak at that meeting.

At a meeting of the same Committee held at the same place March 3rd, 1886, a sub-Committee of three consisting of the President, Dr. Vermilye and the Secretary, was appointed to revise the Constitution and By-Laws, and it was resolved that the amendments to the Constitution and By-Laws proposed at the last annual meeting of the Society, be referred to this committee.

The President then read a letter from A. G. Browning, Esq., Secretary of the London Huguenot Society, in regard to a badge for the members of the several existing Huguenot Societies, and on motion the same was referred to a Committee to be named on "Seal and Diploma."

It was also resolved to hold the Annual Meeting of the Society on April 13th, in the French Church du St. Esprit, and a business meeting prior thereto at 11 o'clock in the Young Men's Christian Asscciation Building.

A meeting of the Executive Committee was held at the residence of the President, 191 Second Avenue, April 12th, 1886, Hon. John Jay, President, in the chair.

On motion the following persons were recommended for election as members of the Society: Mrs. Julia M. Stimson, Messrs. John B. Dumont, J. D. Brez, Rev. Henry Dubois Mulford.

The Secretary was authorized to subscribe for a copy of the Silver Medal, struck by the Commission pour l'histoire des Eglises Wallonnes on the occasion of the bi-centenary of the edict of Nantes.

He was also authorized to have bound for the Society Les Grandes Scènes Historique du XVI Siècle.

The Committee then took up the matter of the revision of the Constitution and By-Laws referred to them by the Society, and recommended to the general Society for adoption certain amendments and alterations to the Constitution and By-Laws.

The annual business meeting of the Society was held on the 13th of April 1886, at the Young Men's Christian Association Building corner of 23d Street and Fourth Avenue.

In the absence of a quorum, the minutes of the previous meeting and also those of the last annual meeting were read and approved, subject to the approval of the Society at its next business meeting.

The Treasurer, Mr. Bartow, then read his annual report, and the Auditing Committee reported that it had examined the same and found it correct. The report was thereupon received and ordered on file.

The Secretary, acting as Librarian, reported during the year ending April 13th, 1886, fourteen books and twenty-five pamphlets had been donated to the Society; with the approbation of the Committee on the Library, twenty-two books had been purchased for the Society; in addition to the above donations, fifty-six works had been purchased for the Society and bound for it at the expense of Abram du Bois, M. D.; and that the Society continued its subscriptions to seven works in course of publication. The report was received and ordered on file.

On motion the meeting then adjourned to re-convene immediately after the public meeting to be held in the evening at the French Church du St. Esprit.

The unfavorable weather having prevented the holding of the public meeting, and a quorum of members being present, the Society in accordance with the foregoing resolution, held a business meeting in the above named church.

The Secretary having read the minutes of the informal meeting, held in the morning, on motion the action then taken was approved.

The Secretary then reported from the Executive Committee, the following ladies and gentlemen for membership in the Society: Mrs. Elizabeth A. Welch, Mrs. Julia A. Stimson, Hon. Elisha Dyer, Messrs. William De La Mater Barbour, J. Prevost Mallet, John B. Dumont, J. D. Brez and Rev. Edward O. Guerrant, D.D., and they were thereupon duly elected members of the Society.

The election of officers being in order the following were duly elected:

President:

HON. JOHN JAY.

Vice-President for New York:

EDWARD F. DE LANCEY, Esq.

Vice-President for Staten Island, N. Y.:

HON. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW.

Vice-President for New Rochelle, N. Y.:
HENRY M. LESTER, Esq.

Vice-President for New Paltz, N. Y.:
A. T. CLEARWATER, Esq.

Vice-President for Boston, Mass.:
HON. ROBERT C. WINTHROP.

Vice-President for New Oxford, Conn.:
RICHARD OLNEY, Esq.

Vice-President for Narragansett, R. I.:
WILLIAM ELY, Esq.

Vice-President for New Jersey.
REV. DAVID D. DEMAREST, D.D.

Vice-President for Delaware:
HON. THOMAS F. BAYARD.

Vice-President for Pennsylvania:
CHARLES M. DU PUY, Esq.

Vice-President for South Carolina:
DANIEL RAVENEL, Esq.

Secretary:
REV. A. V. WITTMEYER.

Treasurer:
P. W. GALLAUDET, Esq.

Librarian and Curator:
W. H. BUDD, Esq.

The following Committees were appointed by the President:

Executive Committee:
JOSIAH H. GAUTIER, M. D.
REV. B. F. DECOSTA, D.D.
FREDERIC J. DE PEYSTER, Esq.
HON. HENRY W. BOOKSTAVER.
H. W. BARTOW, Esq.

[By the Constitution of the Society the President, Vice-Presidents, Secretary, Treasurer and Librarian of the Society are *ex-officio* members of this Committee.]

Publication and Library Committee:
EDWARD F. DE LANCEY, Esq.
REV. ASHBEL G. VERMILYE, D.D.
REV. B. F. DE COSTA, D.D.

On motion the Society resolved to create the office of Librarian and Curator and Mr. W. H. Budd was elected to such office.

The Executive Committee, to whom the revision of the Constitution and By-Laws was referred at the last Annual Meeting, then reported through the Secretary, the amendments which they proposed, which amendments were on motion voted on separately, and severally adopted. After which, the Constitution and By-Laws were adopted as a whole, and the Secretary was requested to have five hundred copies of the same printed as amended. [This having subsequently been done, the same are here omitted.]

A vote of thanks was tendered to Abram du Bois, M. D., for the valuable books donated by him to the Society; and also to J. H. Gautier, M. D., for his generous subscription toward purchasing a number of foreign Huguenot autographs.

The sudden death of General W. G. de Saussure, President of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina, having been announced to the Society, the President appointed Dr. de Costa, Dr. Sell and the Secretary, a Committee to draft a series of appropriate resolutions.

A vote of thanks was tendered to Mr. Bartow for the efficiency with which he had discharged his duty as Treasurer of this Society for the past three years.

On motion the President was requested to appoint a Committee of three to devise an appropriate seal and a certificate of membership for the Society.

On motion the question of defraying the clerical labor of the Treasurer and Secretary, was referred to the Executive Committee with power.

On motion the meeting then adjourned.

The Executive Committee met pursuant to call, at the residence of the President, 191 Second Avenue, October 5th, 1886. Hon. John Jay, President, in the chair.

On motion, a letter of the Rev. Mr. Paschal, received by the Secretary, was referred to a committee consisting of Rev. B. H. DeCosta, D.D., and Mr. Edward F. de Lancey, to report thereon at the next meeting of the Society.

On motion the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That the Act of Incorporation of the Huguenot Society of

America, its Constitution and By-Laws, and the list of its members, be printed under the direction of the Secretary of the Society, the pamphlet to be of the same size as the Bi-Centenary proceedings of the Society.

It was then resolved to hold the next meeting of the Society in the Consistory Room of the Reformed Dutch Church, Fifth Avenue, corner of 29th Street.

It was further Resolved, That at such meeting brief addresses should be made on the nature and importance of the First Volume of the Society's Collections.

Rev. Chas. S. Vedder, D.D., Pastor of the Huguenot Church of Charleston, S. C., appeared before the Committee by invitation, in order to make known the needs of the church of which he was Pastor which he proceeded to do with great clearness and pathos, whereupon it was unanimously Resolved that the Executive Committee of the Huguenot Society of America deeply sympathizes with the members of the Huguenot Church in Charleston, S. C., in the injury sustained by their church edifice from the recent earthquakes in that city, and warmly recommend to their countrymen and especially to those of Huguenot descent, the efforts now being made by Dr. Vedder, Pastor of the said church, to secure funds for its restoration. [This appeal was so favorably received that in a short time Dr. Vedder secured ample funds for that purpose.]

The following Resolution was also adopted:

Resolved, That the First Volume of the Collections of the Society, now in proof, be distributed as follows; one copy to each member of the Society who has paid his dues to April 1886; 12 copies to be presented to the Rector of the Church du St. Esprit, N. Y.; one hundred copies to be sent to the press and honorary members of the Society, and leading Colleges, Societies, Libraries and Theological Seminaries, one hundred copies to be retained for the use of the Society; as many copies as may be necessary to supply donors to the fund who are not members of the Society; and one hundred copies to be offered for sale at six dollars per volume. The distribution to be had under the direction of the Committee on Publication.

Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer then tendered his resignation as Secretary of the Society, and on motion the resignation was laid on the table, and the Secretary was requested to reconsider his determination.

Proceedings of a meeting of the Huguenot Society of America which was held at the Chapel of the Collegiate Church, corner of 29th street and Fifth avenue, October 15th, 1886, Hon. John Jay, President, in the Chair.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved.

After brief verbal reports by the Secretary and Treasurer on mat-

ters pertaining to their respective offices. Mr. Edward F. de Lancey reported on behalf of the Committee on Publication that the First Volume of the Society's Collections was printed, and presented two copies of it.

Mr. Wittmeyer took exception to certain alterations made in the language of certain portions of the introduction, and on motion this matter was referred to the Executive Committee.

The Secretary then offered his resignation, to take effect immediately after the next meeting of the Executive Committee, which was accepted.

The following resolution was thereupon adopted:

WHEREAS, The Huguenot Society of America had its origin with the Rev. Alfred V. Wittmeyer, Pastor of the French Church du St. Esprit, in the City of New York; and Whereas, the growth and success of the Society is in a very large degree due to the uniform courtesy and signal ability with which he has performed the arduous duties of Secretary since the inception of the Society; and

WHEREAS, This Society desires to perpetuate a deep sense of its indebtedness to the Rev. Alfred V. Wittmeyer in acknowledgment of his eminent and laborious services in its behalf upon his retirement from the office of Secretary; therefore, be it

Resolved, That a suitable memorial be prepared expressive of the high estimation in which he is held by the Society, and in acknowledgment of the Society's indebtedness to him for his invaluable services, and that such memorial be handsomely engrossed and suitably framed for presentation to him.

On motion the subject of electing a new Secretary was referred to the Executive Committee.

Professor Beokeram, of Paris, then gave a very interesting and instructive address to the Society, and was followed by Mr. Frederick J. DePeyster, both dwelling upon the sacrifices, the disinterestedness, and the fortitude of the Huguenots.

On motion, the Society then adjourned.

The Executive Committee held its regular meeting at the residence of the President, 191 Second Avenue, November 18th, 1886, Hon. John Jay, President, in the Chair.

Messrs. Faber, Bennett and Voutè, whose applications for membership were read at the preceding meeting, were duly elected members of the Society.

On motion, the Secretary and Rev. B. H. DeCosta, were named a Committee to examine DeVillier's manuscript, and if they deemed the matter of sufficient importance to have the same copied for the Society.

Mr. de Lancey was authorized to purchase for the Society, at a price

not exceeding fifteen dollars, two Huguenot works and several manuscript sermons by Rev. Andre le Mercier.

On motion, the matter of the alteration of certain language in the introduction of the Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer to the First Volume of the Society's Collections, was referred to the Committee on Publication for adjustment.

The Secretary, whose resignation took effect at the close of the meeting, was requested to continue to discharge the duty of that office, and he consented to act as such provisionally.

The Executive Committee held its regular meeting at the residence of the President, 191 Second avenue, February 18th, 1887, Hon. John Jay in the chair.

In the absence of the Treasurer, his Clerk made a report of the Society's funds, from which it appeared that the Treasurer had cash on hand sixty dollars ($60), regular fund on deposit $1,399.66, publication fund $28.98, total $1,488.64; that there was due to the Society a subscription to the publication fund of $50; that there remained unpaid the printer, on account of the First Volume of Collections published, the sum of $495.50.

The Treasurer was authorized to transfer from the general fund to the publication fund the amount necessary to pay the printer in full, such amount to be returned to the general fund as soon as the publication fund permitted.

Applications for membership were received from Mrs. Mary E. VanderBurgh, Mrs. Flora Bevere Neely, Messrs. S. Macrae de la Grange, William G. Thomas, Joseph H. Perot, Thos. Le Boutillier.

On motion, Rev. B. H. DeCosta, D.D., and Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer were appointed a Committee to make the necessary preparations for the ensuing annual meeting.

The Committee then adjourned to meet March 4th, 1887, at the same place.

Pursuant to adjournment the Executive Committee met March 4th, 1887. Hon. John Jay in the chair.

On motion, the ladies and gentlemen whose applications were presented at the last meeting, were duly elected members of the Society.

The Treasurer reported that he had carried out the instructions of the Executive Committee, and had paid the printer in full by transferring the necessary amount from the general fund of the Society.

On motion of Mr. Lester, the following resolution was adopted: The announcement of the sudden death of the Rev. Chas. W. Baird, D.D., of Rye, on the 10th February last, the esteemed author of the "Huguenot Emigration to America," having been made to this Committee at its meeting this day, Resolved, that the President, at his convenience, appoint a special committee to prepare a memorial notice of

Dr. Baird. to be read at the approaching annual meeting of the Society as a tribute to his memory and in testimony of his early, arduous and successful labors in the field of American Huguenot history, for which this Society feels it is under the deepest obligations.

The Executive Committee met at the residence of the President, 191 Second Avenue, March 18th, 1887. Hon. John Jay, President, in the chair.

Dr. DeCosta, Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements for the next annual meeting, reported progress.

The Treasurer was authorized to purchase "De Crespigny's Huguenot Roll"; and to pay for copying eight pages of manuscript ordered by the Society through Dr. DeCosta; and also for a copy of Les Montalbanais et le Refuge, by H. de France.

The Secretary was requested to furnish Mr. Whittaker, the bookseller, with the names and addresses of European Societies and Libraries to which he is to send copies of the Society's Volumes of Collections.

The Committee on Publication made a report in regard to the alteration of the introduction, which report was referred to a Special Committee, composed of Judge Bookstaver, Rev. B. H. DeCosta, D.D., and Rev. A. G. Vermilye, D.D., with full power to make such adjustment of the same as may seem to them proper, and which shall be accepted as conclusive in the matter.

This Committee subsequently adjusted the matter by causing to be printed the author's text as he wrote it, calling attention to the alteration made by the Publication Committee, and sending a copy of it to all who had received the volumes, and also inserting it in all others undisposed of.

On motion it was then resolved that the sum of $50, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be set apart for the payment of such assistance as the Treasurer may require in the discharge of the duties of his office; and that a like sum be set apart for like services in the discharge of the duties of the Secretary's office.

Mr. Charles Lanier was then proposed as a member of the Society.

The Annual Meeting of the Society was held in the Chapel of the Collegiate Church, corner of 29th street and Fifth avenue, April 13th, 1887. Hon. John Jay, President, in the Chair.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved.

The Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer, acting as Librarian, read the Annual report, which was accepted and ordered on file.

Mr. Gallaudet, the Treasurer, read his annual report, which having been audited and found correct, was accepted and ordered on file.

The President appointed a Committee of three, composed of Rev. B. F. DeCosta and Messrs. Gallaudet and DuPuy, to nominate officers for

the ensuing year: which committee renominated the present officers of the Society, with the exception of the Librarian and Curator, who being absent from the city was replaced by the Secretary, Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer; the report was accepted, and the officers nominated by it were duly elected. The Secretary was directed to cast a ballot as the vote of the Society.

The following persons were duly elected members of the Society: Mr. J. T. Atterbury, Hon. James White, Rev. Mr. Curry, Mrs. P. E. Towle.

On motion, the report of Mr. Whittaker, bookseller, in regard to the sale of the First Volume of the Society's Collections, was accepted, and he was authorized to inform those members of the Society who had not yet withdrawn their volumes that the same were at their disposal; and the Treasurer was requested to furnish him with the names of such new members as were entitled to the volume.

Mr. de Lancey, Chairman of the Committee appointed to prepare a memorial notice of the late Rev. Dr. Baird, then read the same, which was adopted and ordered on file, and a copy to be sent to the family of the deceased. It is as follows:

The Special Committee of the Executive Committee of the Huguenot Society of America, appointed to prepare for the action of the Society, a memorial notice of the late Dr. Charles W. Baird, respectfully present the following:

MEMORIAL NOTICE OF THE REV. CHARLES W. BAIRD, D.D.

The Huguenot Society of America, since its last meeting, has heard with the deepest sorrow, of the sudden death, on the tenth of February last, at his home in Rye, New York, of the Reverend Charles W. Baird, D.D., one of the few who originally met at the New York Historical Society's Library to organize this Society, and the learned author of the "History of the Huguenot Emigration to America," recently published.

Dr. Baird was the first to arouse publicly the descendants of the Huguenots in America, to the importance of preserving and perpetuating the early history and records of their French and Walloon ancestors. Upwards of twelve years before his death he called the attention of those of them in Westchester county and New York city to this subject, in an address at White Plains, before the Westchester county Historical Society; and which was repeated upon other occasions.

He was the earliest to examine and study the ancient records of the French church in this city, freely opened to him by the late Rector of that church and its wardens and vestrymen, with the spirit, eye, intention, and hand, of the historian. In like manner, did he investigate those of New Rochelle and New Paltz, in this State, and those of the Huguenot centres in the other old States; as well as the many private papers willingly laid before him. The results, in part, of these labors, are now before the world in the two volumes above named, which will

ever remain a monument of his ability and skill in this, his chosen field of historic research.

Twice did he cross the ocean for no other purpose than to investigate, and profit by, the European sources of American Huguenot history. And this, too, of his own volition, and at his own charge.

Personally, Dr. Baird was one of the most refined, retiring, and courteous of men, as well as one of the most winning. Firm in his convictions, gentle in his manners, sensitive in his feelings, he was ever the Christian gentleman, and the loved and trusted guide, counsellor, and friend. In placing this memorial notice upon its minutes, this Society bears witness to the great loss, which, in common with all of Huguenot descent in America, it has sustained in his too early death, and adds its tribute so justly due to his memory and his worth, in loving testimony of its appreciation of his early and successful labors in the field of American Huguenot history.

EDWARD F. DE LANCEY,
B. F. DE COSTA,
} *Committee.*

New York, April 13th, 1887.

On motion of the Secretary, a free copy of the First Volume of the Society's Collections was ordered to be sent to Mr. Frenow, of Albany.

On motion, the price of the First Volume of the Society's Collections to new members, was fixed at three dollars.

The President then re-appointed the Executive Committee and the Committee on Publication and Library of the preceding year, substituting in the place of Mr. Bartow, the Rev. A. G. Vermilye, D.D.

Various addresses were made reviewing the progress of the Society, during the past year.

On motion, the Society then adjourned.

A meeting of the Executive Committee was held at the office of the Treasurer, No. 2 Wall street, Oct. 11th, 1887.

On motion, a committee consisting of Drs. J. H. Gautier, M. D., Abram Du Bois, M. D. and Rev. B. H. De Costa, was appointed to confer with a similar committee named by the Holland Society to consider the project of erecting a suitable building for the common use of these two and other kindred Societies.

On motion, the following persons were elected members of the Society: Mrs. Pauline E. Towle, Messrs. Charles Lanier, John Paul A. Oliver, John T. Atterbury, Henry Wagner.

Messrs. Jay, Lester and Du Puy, were appointed a Committee to suggest improvements in the Constitution and By-Laws of the Society.

On motion it was resolved to hold the Fall meeting of the Society on the 31st of Oct, in the Young Men's Christian Association Building at an hour to be agreed upon by the Secretary and the Association.

The election of officers being in order the following were duly elected:

President:

HON. JOHN JAY.

Vice-President for New York:

EDWARD F. DE LANCEY, Esq.

Vice-President for Staten Island, N.Y.:

HON. CHAUNCEY M. DEPEW.

Vice-President for New Rochelle, N. Y.:

HENRY M. LESTER, Esq.

Vice-President for New Paltz, N. Y.:

A. T. CLEARWATER, Esq.

Vice-President for Boston, Mass.:

HON. ROBERT C. WINTHROP.

Vice-President for New Oxford, Conn.:

RICHARD OLNEY, Esq.

Vice-President for Narragansett, R. I.:

WILLIAM ELY, Esq.

Vice-President for New Jersey.

REV. DAVID D. DEMAREST, D.D.

Vice-President for Delaware:

HON. THOMAS F. BAYARD.

Vice-President for Pennsylvania:

CHARLES M. DU PUY, Esq.

Vice-President for South Carolina:

DANIEL RAVENEL, Esq.

Secretary:

REV. A. V. WITTMEYER.

Treasurer:

P. W. GALLAUDET, Esq.

Acting Librarian and Curator:
REV. A. V. WITTMEYER.

Executive Committee:
JOSIAH H. GAUTIER, M. D.
REV. B. F. DECOSTA, D.D.
FREDERIC J. DE PEYSTER, Esq.
HON. HENRY W. BOOKSTAVER.
REV. A. G. VERMILYE.

And the President, Vice-Presidents, Secretary, Treasurer and Librarian and Curator of the Society, *ex-officio.*

Publication and Library Committee:
EDWARD F. DE LANCEY, Esq.
REV. ASHBEL G. VERMILYE, D.D.
REV. B. F. DE COSTA, D.D.

The Autumn Meeting of the Society was held at the Young Men's Christian Association Building, October 31st, 1887.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved.

The report of the Committee on contemplated changes in the Constitution and By-Laws of the Society, appointed at the last meeting of the Society, was read by the Chairman, and after a prolonged discussion in which a number of members took part, on motion of Dr. Vermilye, seconded by Mr. Rappelye, the Committee was enlarged by the addition of Rev. A. D. Vermilye, D. D., Mr. Banyer Clarkson, and Mr. Edward F. de Lancey, and the Committee was requested to continue its consideration of the subject and to report thereon at the April meeting of the Society.

A Committee consisting of Dr. DeCosta, Mr. Pumpelly and Dr. Vermilye, was appointed to secure the services of the Hon. Chauncey M. Depew, as a speaker at the next meeting of the Society, and if he cannot do so, then to secure the services of some other speaker.

The Secretary then read a letter from Professor Charles W. Briggs, D. D., in which he regretted his inability to address the Society at its next Annual Meeting, but offered to do so at the following Annual Meeting; and on motion, the offer was cordially accepted.

It was resolved that the Chair appoint a Committee of five ladies, whose duty it shall be to place themselves in communication with ladies in the different Huguenot centres of the country, and to further the interests of the Society in such directions as may to them seem best, and that such Committee report at the next Annual Meeting. The Chair appointed as members of this Committee Mrs. Martha J.

Lamb, Mrs. William H. Budd, Mrs. Julia A. Stimson, Mrs. H. C. Jones, and Mrs. Guyon.

A meeting of the Executive Committee was held at No. 5 Washington Place, February 8th, 1888. Hon. John Jay in the chair.

The following memorial to the Library Committee of Columbia College, was adopted:

"The Huguenot Society of America respectfully asks the Trustees of Columbia College, whether it will be permitted the Society to place its collection of books, pamphlets and manuscripts in the College Library on similar conditions to those already granted to the Academy of Sciences. In the arrangement referred to with the authorities of Columbia College the Huguenot Society will expect to retain its owership of the collection, which shall be stored together, cared for and made accessible for reference to both members of the Society and the College during regular Library hours. While no legal agreement is asked for on either side, it is the hope of the Society that the arrangement will prove mutually advantageous and that its library, to the growth of which special attention is to be given, will continue permanently a valuable acquisition to the University Library.

The Society would expect to bear the expense of needed cataloguing, and if the growth of its collection should make desirable a special Librarian, to provide a satisfactory officer without charge to the college, and to meet other incidental expenses for the Society's Library. The Society further requests the privilege of using occasionally, for its meetings, one of the halls of the college, that may not otherwise be in use at the time."

And on motion a Special Committee was appointed to confer with the authorities of Columbia College in reference to the matter, and it was empowered to make such modifications of the above memorial as to details as in its judgment should be deemed desirable, subject to the final approval of the Society.

This Committee was composed of the Joint Committee before appointed, substituting Judge Bookstaver for Dr. Vermilye.

William B. Ogden, Esq., was duly elected a member of the Society.

Miss M. S. Clark and Henry B. Cannon, Esq., made application for membership.

The Treasurer was authorized to purchase at auction "Quick's Synodicon."

At a subsequent meeting of the Executive Committee at the same place, Hon. John Jay in the Chair.

A letter was read from President Barnard, of Columbia College, stating that the prayer of this Society requesting that its Library might be placed, under certain conditions in the Library of the College had

been granted by the Library Committee and referred to the Trustees of the College.

The Committee on the annual meeting reported that it had secured the services of Hon. Chauncey M. Depew as one of the speakers on that occasion and that it had others in view.

The annual meeting was fixed for April 13th, 1888, and Banyer Clarkson, Esq., was added to the committee, which was given full power to arrange for the hour and place of meeting and to expend a sum not exceeding $200 for the purpose of the meeting.

Mr. and Mrs. Cyrus Clark, Miss S. M. Clark and Henry B. Cannon, Esq., were duly elected members of the Society.

Frederick J. Stimson, Mrs. Julia A. Loomis, Charles M. Vail and Mrs. Maria J. Sinsabaugh, were proposed as members of the Society.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee held in the Young Men's Christian Association Building, 4th avenue and 23rd street, April 13th 1888.

Charles M. Du Puy in the absence of the President was called to the Chair.

Frederick J. Stimson, Mrs. Julia A. Loomis, Mrs. J. Sinsabaugh, and Charles M. Vail, Esq., were duly elected members of the Society.

Miss E. E. Dana was proposed for membership.

The Committee on the annual meeting then reported that they had secured Hon. Chauncey M. Depew, Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., and Prof. Allan Marquand, of Princeton College, as speakers.

The President was requested to appoint a Committee of three, to secure speakers for the annual meeting next year.

The Annual Meeting of the Huguenot Society of America was held at the Young Men's Christian Association Building, corner of Fourth avenue and 23rd street, April 13th, 1888. Hon. John Jay in the Chair.

The minutes of the previous meeting were read and approved. Mr. Gallaudet the Treasurer, read his annual report, which having been examined by the Auditing Committee and reported correct, was accepted and ordered on file. Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer, as Acting Librarian, read his Annual Report, which was accepted and ordered on file. Mrs. Lamb, Chairman of the Ladies' Special Committee, and Mr. Du Puy, Chairman of the Gentlemen's Special Committee, made their reports, which were accepted and ordered on file. A vote of thanks was tendered to Mrs. Lamb for her co-operation in the welfare of the Society.

Mr. Du Puy presented a new Constitution to be acted upon, the consideration of which was postponed until the adjourned meeting to be held immediately before the Public Meeting on the 20th inst. Dr. De Costa proposed an amendment to the clause concerning the non-

payment of dues by Army and Navy Officers and Clergymen, which was also postponed until that meeting.

The Society then proceeded to the election of officers for the year 1888-'89, which resulted in the election of the officers of the preceding year, except that Mr. Banyer Clarkson was elected Secretary of the Society, on motion of Rev. A. V. Wittmeyer, who said it would be impossible for him to further act in that capacity.

Mr. Lester moved that a Committee be appointed to prepare a minute on the late Morey Hale Bartow, Esq.

The Chair reserved the naming of the various Committees until the adjourned meeting on the 20th inst.

The Society then adjourned to meet on Friday, April 20th, at 8 P. M., at the Berkely Lyceum, 19 West 44th street.

The Society met pursuant to adjournment.

The Revised Constitution was then considered, and after discussion adopted, and on motion, the Secretary was directed to print five hundred copies of the same, with a list of officers and committees, in the same style as the "List of Members," and that he send it together with a copy of the "List of Members," to each member of the Society.

The following were proposed as members of the Society: Prof. J. K. Ries, L. Turnure, Jr., Rev. R. R. Hoes, and the matter of their election was referred to the Executive Committee. Rev. R. R. Hoes was requested to prepare a paper to be read before the Society at its next meeting.

The President then announced the Committees and Special Committees of the Society for 1888-'89. These, together with the officers of the Society, will be published in the next number of the Proceedings of the Society.

The Society then adjourned to attend the Public Meeting in the theatre of the Berkely Lyceum, where the following addresses were made.

HON. JOHN JAY, THE PRESIDENT OF THE SOCIETY, THEN SAID:

Ladies and Gentlemen:—The day fixed by the constitution of the Huguenot Society of America for their annual April meeting is the anniversary, this year the 290th, of the promulgation by Henry IV, in April, 1598, of the Edict of Nantes. That memorable decree for some eighty-seven years gave peace and security to the Huguenots of France; and to its revocation by Louis XIV, was due the vast emigration under the greatest trials and dangers, which proved so great a blessing to the countries which received them and so permanent an injury to France.

Three years since, on October 22, 1885, this Society commemorated the bi-centennial of the Revocation of that Edict, and on that occasion, for the first time in our history, American descendants of the

Huguenots from the farthest parts of our republic met at New York, entered in procession the Church of the St. Esprit, for a solemn service and addresses, in which citizens of Huguenot descent, from Charleston, Washington and other capitals, headed by Mr. Bayard, the Secretary of State, took a prominent part. In the evening a reception and repast reunited, amid pleasant surroundings and historic memories, descendants whose ancestors had been separated and driven from France, some two hundred years before.

The chief oration of that bi-centennial was pronounced by our learned associate, Dr. Henry M. Baird, upon the Edict of Nantes; and you can nowhere, I think, find within the same compass a more true or graphic sketch of the curiously compounded character of Henry IV., with its rare virtues and regretable blemishes; or of the history and character of the edict, by no means a perfect law, but, viewed in the light of that age, a marvel in the history of the development of political thought, adding immensely to the religious freedom, the safety and happiness of the Huguenots. To the end of time that edict will find its chief and enduring eulogy in the anathema of Pope Clement. "The Edict," said his Holiness, "is the most accursed that can be imagined, whereby liberty of conscience is granted to everybody, which is the worst thing in the world. * * Moreover, I see that the King has made the Edict at a time when he is at peace, both within and without his realm, so that it cannot be said that he has been compelled to make it."

This Papal admission that that just edict was a voluntary act, may be fitly remembered as we recall Henry's inexcusable abjuration of his early faith.

This, says the French historian, M. de Felice, which had been called the conversion of Henry IV., was "an affair of politics, female influence, priestly fiction, falsehood from beginning to end," and it did not save him from the dagger of Ravaillac.

The revocation of that edict by Louis XIV, was hailed by bishop and archbishop as the most brilliant episode of a brilliant reign. To-day the act stands in the world's history without a rival or a parallel—unless in the massacre of St. Bartholomew—either as a kingly and priestly crime; or as a Jesuitical and political blunder.

It impoverished France, not for a single generation but for successive ages, with the disastrous consequences, moral, social and political, to the France of to-day, which, despite the devoted and successful efforts making by our friends in that republic, largely lacks the presence of that Protestant and cultured element which Louis, with such incredible folly, drove from France, and to whose loss in the departure of the Huguenots, the gravest historians now attribute the horrors and the shame of the French Revolution.

There is an interesting incident mentioned by the author of the

paper on "American Huguenots," appended to the American edition of Weiss, where in alluding to the project of the French Governor-General of Canada to reduce New England and New York in the time of Andross, who was a Protestant, he states that Albany was first to be surprised and captured, and then Manhattan was to be reduced; and that Louis, in approving the expedition and ordering that faithful Catholics be unmolested, ordered also that the French refugees, particularly those of the pretended reformed religion, *must be sent back to France*. These instructions were given to Frontenac four years after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the designs of France and of Rome in those days have thus a personal interest for ourselves.

We owe it first to the act of Louis in revoking the Edict of Nantes, and next to the failure of Louis' instructions to Frontenac to send back our ancestors, that we are here to-night, and that the Huguenot Society of America, at whose invitation you have kindly assembled, although still in its first lustrum, is developing an encouraging degree of strength and spirit and a rising promise of growth and usefulness.

One interesting branch of inquiry in regard to the Huguenot refugees in America is yet to be systematically pursued in France. An increasing number of American descendants are making pilgrimages to La Rochelle and other places of note in Huguenot history, seeking out their ancestral homes, searching the Huguenot church records and municipal offices, and national and departmental archives, not forgetting the MS. department of the Bibliotheque National, and such libraries as those at Poictiers, Angouleme and La Rochelle, which can supply original historic information of the most interesting and authentic character. At La Rochelle the well known archivist and historian, M. Mechinet de Richemond, an honorary member of the New York Historical Society, and also of this association, who has devoted himself to Huguenot history and who is one of the ablest translators into French of Dr. Baird's volumes on Huguenot Emigration, has generously rendered the most effective assistance in discovering entries in the church records, and official entries of the lands and goods of Huguenot refugees which were confiscated to the State.

There is one fact of no little interest to be noted in this connection. The active and in some respects remarkable movement now going on among the Protestants of France, of which you will presently hear from Dr. Schaff, assisted as it is by the descendants of Huguenots in America and England, has tended to re-awaken throughout that Republic the memories of the past. Availing themselves of the ready courtesy of the French government and French officials, Americans who seek mementos of their ancestors in France find French students engaged with similar earnestness in tracing the history of the Huguenots in other lands. The refugees and their descendants form to-day

a link between Protestant France and the countries to whom the Huguenots carried their civilization and their patriotism, based upon a pure and living Christianity. "La Societé de l'Histoire du Protestantism Français," whose admirable and elaborate work is now passing through a new edition, have happily expressed in one of their bulletins (April, 1885,) the idea that the history of France would be incomplete without a record of her Huguenots in other lands. They say :

"By writing the history of the martyrs of their faith we believe that besides performing a pious duty we have filled up a void in our national history. The annals of France were not to remain forever closed to the destinies, often glorious, always honorable, of the scattered refugees. We at least shall have contributed to rescue from oblivion great and noble recollections that deserve to live in the memory of man, and of which France herself has reason to be proud."

In England, to whose skillful industries and commercial wealth the Huguenots so largely added, to whose national independence and constitutional strength they have contributed in war and peace, whose political, social, scientific and industrial resources they have so greatly enlarged, and whose moral and Christian influence they have ennobled and extended, the same feeling seems to have prevailed. The founding of this society was presently followed by that of the Huguenot Society of London, under the well-directed efforts of Mr. Arthur Giraud Browning, of the ancient French Protestant Hospital in London, with Sir Henry Austin Layard, G. C. B., as president, and an accomplished and effective council ; and the admirable publications of that society have afforded a new stimulus to Huguenot inquiry.

One paper by the learned president, published in their proceedings during the last year, has an unusual interest and value for all students of modern history; bringing to light newly discovered and decisive evidence on the question how far the Court of Rome was responsible for the massacre of St. Bartholomew, a point on which even some of our own historians had too readily accepted the persistent and positive denials of Roman Catholic authors.

You may remember that at our pleasant summer meeting at New Rochelle, on the 24th of August, 1885, the subject of that massacre was discussed, and some newly discovered and direct evidence, discovered by Lord Acton, was quoted and commented upon.

Lord Acton, the very distinguished Roman Catholic historian, who so admirably represents the honorable members of that faith, who reject the doctrines and methods of the Jesuits, had remarked, in his clear and learned paper on the Massacre in the *North British Review* (October, 1869), that while the exact details of the death of Coligny and his adherents were known, the origin and motives of the tragedy were still subject to controversy, and that much of the evidence has been destroyed or suppressed. The records relating to it had been ab-

stracted from the archives of Austria, Rome and Venice. In the records of many French towns, the leaves which contain the records of August and September, 1572, have been torn out. And some five years later Lord Acton, in a reply to Mr. Gladstone's paper on the Vatican decrees, illustrated his dissent from the importance given to them by remarking upon things equally bad, if not worse, that had been done by Popes and councils, and treated with contempt by Catholics, laymen and divine, and he said: "Now, Pius V., the only Pope who had been proclaimed a saint for many centuries, having deprived Elizabeth, commissioned an assassin to take her life; and his next successor (Gregory XIII), on learning that the Protestants were being massacred in France, pronounced the action glorious and holy, but comparatively barren of results, and implored the King during two months, by his Nuncio and Legate, to carry the work on to the bitter end until every Huguenot had recanted or perished."

This statement called forth expressions of dissent, and on the 26th November, 1874, Lord Acton contributed a letter to the London *Times* (page 6), in which he gave proofs of its exactness, in letters in Italian from the Pope's Nuncio, Salviati (22d September, 1572), communicating to the King the desire of his Holiness, "for the great glory of God and the greatest welfare of France, to see all the heretics of the kingdom exterminated;" from Salviati (11th October, 1672), that the Holy Father had experienced "an infinite joy and great consolation in learning that his majesty had commanded me to write that he hoped that in a little while France would have no more Huguenots: *qu'il esperait qu'avant peu la France n'aurait plus de Huguenots.*" On the 19th December, 1572, Cardinal Orsini, who had been dispatched as Legate from Rome, congratulated the King on the glory of the massacre and pressed to him to renew his promise that not a single Huguenot should be left on the soil of France. The direct proofs, happily supplied by Lord Acton (Note 1) have been supplemented by Sir Henry Layard, and amid "the wholesale destruction of evidence which might have thrown light on the true history of this shameful deed," in which, as Sir Henry remarks, the Court of Rome, the Court of France and the Jesuits were all "three deeply implicated," the truth of history was still to be vindicated. In the year 1572, Mocenigo being Doge of Venice, there were two Ambassadors from that republic at the French Court, Giovanni Michiel, a distinguished statesman who had been Ambassador to Rome, and Sigismondo Cavalli, the permanent representative of the Venetian Republic at Paris. Among the volumes of their dispatches, those for the year 1572, both from Rome and Paris, have disappeared, but fortunately, at Venice, most of the dispatches of Michiel and Cavalli for that year, the original copies of which have disappeared, were included in what are called the "Annali della Repubblica," which were compiled in pursuance of a special decree of the

Senate for preservation in the State archives. Of these dispatches Sir Henry Austin Layard has given translations in his paper, and to these he has added various facts supplying additional evidence of premeditation, both with respect to the assassination of Coligny and to a general massacre of the Huguenots, proving utterly false the excuse put forth by the King and his mother that it was in self-defence. Sir Henry, after the most critical examination of the evidence comes to the conclusion that "There cannot be a doubt that Pius V. had instigated Charles and the queen mother to exterminate the Huguenots, and that Salviati had been instructed to press the matter upon them."

After quoting Signor Gar, who had come to a similar conclusion after an examination of the documents in the Venetian archives, Sir Henry refers to Lord Acton as having reached the same results, and quotes the remarkable words with which Lord Acton concludes his admirable paper on the massacre, words worthy of remembrance by those who deal with historical questions which require to be treated without religious or historical bias. "Such things," said Lord Acton, "will cease to be written when men perceive that truth is the only merit which gives dignity and worth to history."

Apart from the interest which the history of the persecution of the Huguenots by the Jesuits must always have for intelligent and thoughtful readers, as marking the relentless temper and the peculiar methods with which certain of the Popes and their political and clerical agents pursued those who stood firmly on the word of God and the right of the people to read and obey it, this history has an exceptional and impressive force at this time for the descendants of the Huguenots in America, and for all Americans who honor their principles and their heroism, for the reason that here the Jesuit policy is again at work, and we are reminded by the events of to-day that history is philosophy teaching by example.

The dogmas and maxims of the Jesuits are, as we all know, the reverse of those held and cherished by the American people, and are in fact so absolutely antagonistic to American sentiments and American principles that our credulous and too confiding countrymen who have not carefully studied their history are reluctant to believe that they have brought to this free land the same doctrines that were held by Loyola and Laynez and reduced to practice by Torquemada.

But the unchangeable character of the Jesuits was declared in the famous answer of their general in 1761 to the great counsel of France, which proposed that they should be modified in that kingdom, or that the order should be dissolved. He replied: "*Sint ut sunt aut non sint*"—Let them remain as they are or let them cease to exist. And Cardinal Manning, who on this point speaks with an experience and an authority which we are bound to recognize, in a sermon devoted to praise of Loyola and the Jesuits, says of the order that it embodies the

character of its founder: "The same energy, perseverance and endurance. It is his own presence still prolonged, the same perpetuated order even in the spirit and manner of its working, fixed, uniform and changeless."

The *Quarterly Review* (October, 1887, page 288), says in a passage on "The Catholic Revival of the Sixteenth Century" that "the society is doomed to decay; that it has been for three centuries the mainstay of bigotry and sectarian uncharity; and that whatever are the sins of Rome against liberty and religion, they have been committed chiefly by the means and at the suggestion of Jesuits. The Jesuits have been more Roman than the Romans. Popes have discountenanced and disbanded them; but the society has bided its time; true to the principles of obedience, it has bowed for the time and waited till a new Pope has restored its former ascendancy."

Governed by the military and absolute rule of their general, they hold to the supreme obedience, which they illustrate by a corpse under the knife of the surgeon, *perinde ac cadaver*. Their desire is for followers that in this respect resemble the dead more than the living, according to the ancient maxim, "*Mortuos non vivos ego meos volo.*" The American common school, which protects children from theologic dogma, surrounds them with the pure and gentle influence of the tolerant Christianity of our fathers, and gives a training based upon freedom of conscience, freedom of judgment and personal responsibility, is the one institution which blocks their path and constitutes the fortress of our civil and religious freedom, and of the blessings which flow from our Christian civilization. "During the last three centuries," says Macaulay of Rome, "to stunt the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth and in the arts of life has been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude and in intellectual torpor; while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets."

The Jesuit policy of secrecy and treachery and no faith with heretics, which chose the nuptials of Henry as a fitting opportunity for the St. Bartholomew massacre, luring his friends to a joyful festivity when as it was predicted the birds were to be caged, and the wedding favors were to be crimson, and the murder of Coligny was to inaugurate a crime so gigantic in its infamy that it will never be forgotten—the policy of the Jesuits, changing neither with time nor place, is to day felt in American politics, as they strive to effect in our State and national legislation the downfall of our common schools and religious freedom. Silence and secrecy on such questions are in accord neither

with our character nor with our safety; whether as regards the truth of history in the past, which Lord Acton and Sir Henry have illuminated, or the history which our ancient foes are renewing against all Americans who, like the Huguenots, rest their faith upon the word of God, we may safely adopt as our watchword the advice of our associate by whom you will presently be addressed when in his oration at Chicago on our political mission, with a wisdom that true Americans will recognize, he exclaimed: "Turn on the lights."

The President then introduced Professor Allan Marquand, of Princeton College, who spoke as follows:

HUGUENOT INDUSTRIES IN AMERICA.

As early as the middle of the sixteenth century efforts were made by the illustrious Admiral de Coligny to establish colonies of French Protestants in America. His purpose was not merely to secure for the adherents of the Reformed religion a home where they might enjoy the full liberty of their faith, but conscious of the industrial worth of his own people and stimulated by the successful enterprises of Spain, his plan was, as he himself expressed it, "So to manage that in a little while we may have the *finest trade* in all Christendom."* But the early efforts to establish French colonies in Brazil and Florida were neither strong enough nor managed with sufficient wisdom to prove successful. Catholicism and Spain had too strong a hold upon this portion of the New World.

In the early seventeenth century, or the fifty years which preceded the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, many French Protestants found a refuge in the West Indies, and particularly in the islands of St. Christopher, Guadeloupe and Martinique. Here they soon surpassed the Roman Catholics in influence and wealth, if not in numbers. Of them a Catholic historian writes: "Whoever knows the merchants of the Pretended Reformed Religion knows that commerce has no better and more faithful agents."† A Romish missionary to these islands says of them: "Since all our seaports teem with Huguenot captains, pilots and merchants, whose souls are wholly buried in trade and navigation, and who consequently become more skilled in these matters than the Catholics, it is not to be wondered at that they (*i. e.* Company) should make use of this sort of people to fill the places at their disposal."‡ But the West Indies were not destined to afford an enduring home to French Protestants. Before and soon after the Revocation (1685) we find many of these settlers emigrating to Massachusetts and New York and South Carolina, where under English and Dutch protection they found a securer home.

To the North as well as to the South, enterprising French traders

*Baird, The Huguenot Emigration to America, Vol. I, p. 1.
†Dersalles, Hist. Gen. des Antilles III, p. 215. Baird, I p. 208.
‡Baird I 209. DuFertre, in Hist. Gen. des Antilles III, p. 216.

and fishermen had long plied their calling. During the 16th Century "many of the ships that visited the fishing banks (of Newfoundland) or cruised along the shores of the Gulf of St. Lawrence were owned by Huguenot merchants and manned by Huguenot sailors, whose loud voices were often heard in port and at sea to the indignation of all good Catholics as they joined lustily in singing Clement Marot's Psalms."*

Early in the Century following, DeMonts, a Huguenot gentleman, was commissioned to subject to the power of France the country of Arcadia. A good beginning had been made, and a colony established at Port Royal. "They had erected a small palisaded fort, a mill, store houses and dwellings, and had undertaken the manufacture of tar."† The trade of the country fell more and more into the hands of the Huguenots. But here again the prohibitory power of Jesuitical France restricted the progress of the Protestant colony, and "a permanent residence was granted to none but to Frenchmen professing the Roman Catholic faith." "In this prohibition," says Baird, "religious intolerance pronounced the doom of the French colonial system in America. The exclusion of the Huguenots from New France was one of the most stupendous blunders that history records. The repressive policy pursued by the French Government for the next fifty years, culminating in the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, tended more and more to awaken and to strengthen among the Protestants a disposition to emigrate to foreign lands. Industrious and thrifty, and anxious at any sacrifice to enjoy the liberty of conscience denied them at home, they would have rejoiced to build up a French state in the new world. No other desirable class of the population of France was inclined for emigration. It was with great difficulty that from time to time the feeble colony could be recruited, at vast expense and with inferior material. Meanwhile hundreds of thousands of expatriated Huguenots carried into the Protestant countries of Northern Europe, and into the British colonies of America the capital, the industrial skill, the moral worth, that might have enriched the French possessions and secured to the Gallic race a vast domain upon the North American Continents."‡

The Agricultural classes amongst the French emigrants had preferred to settle in Germany and in the less peopled districts of Holland. As has been seen the earliest French settlers in this country were traders in search of gold in the South or engaged in the fishing and fur trade of the North. But we find even before the Revocation French settlers in the British colonies establishing model farms and engaged especially in the cultivation of the vine. From Beverly's History of Virginia, we learn that "as early as 1610, soon after colonization had an effective

*Baird I, p. 81.
†Baird I, p. 100.
‡Baird I, p. 116.

foothold in Virginia, mention is made of the French, sent over for that purpose, making preparation to plant vines. . . . . They reported that Virginia far excelled their own country of Languedoc, the vines growing in great abundance and variety all over the land; that some of the grapes were of that unusual size that they did not believe them to be grapes until by opening them they had seen their kernels; that they had planted the cuttings of their vines at Michaelmas and had grapes from those very cuttings the Spring following; adding in the conclusion that they had not heard of the like in any other country."*

In 1679 an attempt was made to introduce into the Carolinas the manufactures of wine, oil, silk and other southern products. "Two vessels were fitted out in England, in which were sent a number of French Protestant refugees. . . . The commencement of the attempt to make wine seems to have been encouraging. 'Some of the wine,' says a writer in 1682, 'has been transported to England, which by the best palates was well approved of and more is daily expected. It is not doubted, if the planters as industriously prosecute the propogation of vineyards as they have begun, but Carolina will in a little time prove a magazine and staple for wine to the whole West Indias.'"†

In 1690 large numbers of French refugees were sent to Virginia and the Carolinas. "The agricultural colony on the banks of the Santee," says Weiss, "surpassed all those which the English formed in the same part of the country; although these had brought with them in the first place considerable fortunes, and everything that was necessary to the success of their plantations. The French fugitives on the other hand scarcely possessed the necessaries of life; most of them were not even accustomed to this kind of work. . . . . The English traveller, Lawson, who visited their settlement in 1701, admired the cleanliness and neatness of their habits of life, the happy management of their solidly constructed houses, and all the exterior signs of an ease which much exceeded that of other colonists. . . . . Lawson attributed the superiority of the French over the English to the spirit of union which reigned amongst them. 'They live,' says he, 'like a tribe, like one family. Each one makes it a rule to assist his compatriot in his need, and to watch over his fortune and his reputation with the same care as his own.'"‡

It is interesting to see the French fugitive in Pennsylvania, in New York, in Rhode Island, and in Massachusetts endeavoring in this country to make the same wines which they and their ancestors had made in France. William Penn saw in vine culture an important industry and in 1683 writes to the Free Society of Traders in London: "Whatever tends to the promotion of wine and to the manufacture of linen

*Bishop's History of American Manuf. I, p. 269.
†Bishop, I, p. 271.
‡Weiss' History of French Prot. Refug., I., p. 349.

in these parts, I cannot but wish you to promote; and the French people are most likely in both respects to ensure that design. To that end I would advise you to send for some thousands of plants out of France with some able vignerons and people of the other vocation." His own vineyard, under the care of a Frenchman, now a part of the city of Philadelphia, does not appear to have been a permanent success. In the tragic settlement in the Nipmuck country, at Oxford, Mass., the vine was also cultivated. During a visit to this spot, Mrs. Sigourney, wrote these beautiful lines :

"Green vine that mantlest in thy fresh embrace,
Yon old grey rock, I hear that thou with them
Did'st brave the ocean surge:
Say, drank thy germ
The dews of Languedoc? or slow uncoiled
An infant fibre 'mid the fruitful mould
Of smiling Roussillon? or did'st thou shrink
From the fierce footsteps of a warlike train,
Brother with brother fighting unto death
At fair Rochelle?
Hast thou no tale for me?"

The sad tale which the Nipmuck vineyard has to tell is not merely of religious persecution in the Old World nor of massacre of the Indians in the new. It tells also of the death of an industry which was not fitted to survive under the rude conditions of our early history.

Puritan New England while ready to welcome the sturdy character and religious faith of the French Protestant did not afford in the first century of her history a very attractive field for the work of the skilled artisan, and especially for the fine linens and silks and velvets in which the French Protestant excelled.

Our stern forefathers in New England lived under such laws as these.* In 1633 it was ordered that "no man or woman shall make or buy any slashed clothes other than one slash in each sleeve and another in the back; also all cutt works, imbroidered or needle workt caps, bands, vayles are forbidden hereafter to be made and worn under the aforesaid penalty; also all gold or silver girdles, Holland belts, ruffs, beaver hats are prohibited to be bought or worn, under the aforesaid penalty." In 1634 the authorities of Massachusetts passed the following: "The court, taking into consideration the great, superfluous and unnecessary expenses occasioned by reason of some new and immodest fashions, as also the ordinary wearing of silver, gold, and silk laces, ordered that no persons either men or women shall hereafter buy any apparel, either woollen, silk or linen with any lace on it, silver, gold, or thread, under penalty of forfeiture of such clothes." In 1639 it was enacted

*Bishop, I, p. 318.

that "ladies dresses should not be made with short sleeves; that the arm should be covered down to the wrist and that women's sleeves should never exceed an ell in width." Under these laws a number of ladies were persecuted for such offences as wearing silk hoods and scarfs or for having silver lace about their persons. This austerity of life excluded even the use of paint upon their simple wooden dwellings. "The first church erected in Boston was never painted, within or without, as long as it stood." "The Rev. Thomas Allen, of Charlestown, was called to account, it is said, in 1639, for having paint about his dwelling, but was discharged upon his showing that it was done before his time and was disapproved by him."

With such laws as these emanating from the Modern Athens, the most skillful weavers from France could find in this country no opportunity of making a livelihood without changing their occupation. That many of the weavers who came over from France did thus change their occupation is evident from the fact that in the list of Frenchmen who became Freemen in New York from 1695 to 1750, we find only three names recorded as weavers.

Denton, the earliest writer in the province of the New Netherlands writes in 1670 that "every one make their own linen and a great part of their woolen cloth for ordinary wearing." A classified list of the French freemen of New York, for the fifty years following 1695, shows that Huguenot industry in this city was devoted principally and almost exclusively to trade. Thirty-one became merchants, twenty are recorded as coopers, seventeen mariners, sixteen carpenters or joiners. Amongst the merchants of this period we find the well known names of Stephen and John De Lancey, Augustus and Peter Jay Stephen and Nicholas Bayard, Benjamin Faneuil, Thos. Noel and Thomas Montague. The remainder are distributed amongst a number of simple callings, none of which, except the silversmiths and goldsmiths can be reckoned as specifically Huguenot industries. The mechanical arts and manufactures during this period held a very subordinate position.

By the middle of the eighteenth century, however, we find the mechanical instincts of the Huguenots asserting themselves in the direction of manufacture. In 1742 a Southern French planter, M. Dubreuil, invented a cotton gin for separating the fibre from the seed. "The invention greatly stimulated the culture of cotton by partially removing one of the greatest obstacles to the business as a profitable industry."* In South Carolina in 1755 Mrs. Pinckney, the mother of the Revolutionary General of that name, took to England a quantity of excellent silk raised and spun by her near Charleston, sufficient to make three complete dresses. One of these was presented to the Princess Dowager of Wales, and another to Lord Chesterfield. The

*Bishop I, p. 351,

same Mrs. Pinckney introduced into South Carolina the cultivated indigo, which soon became one of the most profitable articles of French colonial commerce.

A few years later Dr. Franklin interested himself in the establishment of a filature for raw silk in Philadelphia. This was managed by a skillful and intelligent Frenchman, presumably a Huguenot. In March, 1770, we find William Molineux, a French Huguenot in New England, engaged in the establishment of spinning schools and in the manufacture of cloth. He erected at much expense a complete apparatus, viz: mills for working and twisting yarn, and improved the mechanism so that two boys could keep more than 50 looms constantly at work. He also set up looms for weaving and hot and cold presses for finishing the goods, and a dye house with the laudable ambition of turning out large quantities of goods equal in beauty and color, and more lasting than any imported into the colonies.

Another characteristic of Huguenot industry, the manufacture of hats, asserts itself at this time. In New England in 1731 hats were made and exported in such quantities as to arouse complaints from the company of hatters in London. An act was accordingly passed under George II, prohibiting the exportation of hats or felts under penalty of £500. Still stronger was the effort to restrict this industry, as the act provided that no hatter should have more than two apprentices; that no one could become a hatter unless he had served seven years as an apprentice, and that no negro was to work at the business. This industry which had advanced so far in 1731, was one which the New Englanders themselves had taken such pains to discourage only a hundred years before.

Another industry in which the Huguenots excelled was work in metals, and we find amongst the silversmiths and goldsmiths in New York prior to 1750, the following Huguenot names:

	Freeman.
Peter Vergereau,	1721.
John Le Roux,	1722.
Charles Le Roux,	1724.
John Hastier,	1726.
Thauvet Besley,	1727.
Stephan Bourdet,	1730.
William Hourton,	1731.
Christopher Robert,	1731.
Peter Quintard,	1731.
John Moulinar,	1744.

Others, Daniel Dupuy and Peter David, both goldsmiths of this period, went from New York to Philadelphia.

The comparatively large number of such workmen in New York would seem to indicate that the demand for silver plate and for jewelry

was strong enough to keep in employment a number of silversmiths and goldsmiths; so that this class of skilled workmen did not have the same motive for changing their occupations.

The most interesting of the Huguenot goldsmiths in this country was the versatile Paul Revere. His father emigrated from the island of Guernsey and settled as a goldsmith in Boston. The son not only followed the occupation of his father, but engaged in a wider sphere of activity. He had a natural taste for drawing, which led him to design and execute engravings on various articles of silver plate. He made silver vessels for King's Chapel, the First Church and the Old South, Boston. One of the portraits of Revere, that by Copley, shows him at the bench with a silver cup in one hand and engraver's tools at his side.

He established a foundry on Lynn street in Boston which soon became celebrated for the excellence of the brass cannon, the church bells, and engraved plates which were made there. His artistic nature led him still further to produce copper plate engravings. In 1770 he published an engraved print representing the massacre in King street on the memorable 5th of March; in 1774 another representing the landing of the British troops in Boston; in 1775 he engraved the plates, made the press, and printed the bills of the first paper money ordered by the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts; in the following year he engraved a picture emblematical of the repeal of the Stamp Act, and executed a very popular caricature of the "Seventeen Rescinders," which served to increase the odium felt for the seventeen representatives who voted to rescind the vote to send the circular letter to the Provinces calling attention to the alarming state of affairs with the mother country.* In his art, as well as by his famous midnight ride, Paul Revere then appears amongst the earliest champions of American freedom.

The records of art history in this country contain other names of Huguenot origin, amongst which may be mentioned Abraham Delancy, Jr., a portrait painter, a pupil of Benj. West, born in New York in 1740; and Thomas Spence Duché, whose grandfather was a Protestant refugee from France. Duché was also a pupil of Benj. West, and painted the portrait of Bishop Seabury, now in the possession of Trinity College, Hartford, and a portrait of Bishop Provost, now in the Historical Society of New York.

Amongst the architects of Huguenot descent we may well remember the name of Benj. Henry Latrobe, who came to this country in 1796. He built the much admired bank of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia, the substantial south wing of the Capitol at Washington, and the R. C. Cathedral at Baltimore.

*Dunlap's History of the Arts of Design, Vol. I, p. 148.

If we should attempt, with the scanty materials we have been able to gather, to estimate the general influence of the Huguenot refugees upon the industries of this country, we should doubtless find it much less marked than that which they exerted upon the industrial development of England, of Holland, of Germany, or of Switzerland. The condition of the country, at the time of the emigration, was such that agriculturalists and traders were foremost in the struggle for existence. The manufacturers soon found themselves in South Carolina obliged to turn their attention to raising rice and cotton and in Virginia to tobacco; while in the northern provinces the industrial energies were mainly absorbed in commerce. But in whatever direction the versatile Huguenot bent his energies he brought with him traditions of elegance and good taste, a quick wit and inventive ability, a cheerfulness and love of liberty, which are still to be reckoned with the most cherished possessions of our American civilization.

The President then introduced the Rev. Dr. Schaff, who spoke substantially as follows:

I was not born a Huguenot, which was a great mistake, but my better half has three drops of French blood in her veins, from three lines of ancestry, Dubois, Ferree and Le Fevre, so that by marriage I may claim some relationship to you. Besides it has been my good fortune to make my studies in the intimate friendship of a number of the descendants of the Huguenots. One of them is Professor Godet, of Switzerland, who was my daily companion in Berlin when I studied and taught at the University. He is one of the noblest men I ever met.

When studying in Berlin I was in the habit of attending one of the four French churches there, one of which was also attended by Prince Bismark. This reminds me of an incident in the history of the Huguenots.

You are no doubt aware of the fact, that the Elector, Frederick William, called in history the Great Elector, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, invited 25,000 Huguenot refugees to his possessions in Brandenburg, and built them fine churches in Berlin, and several other Prussian cities. Many of these French churches are still kept up, and in several of them there is preaching in French every Sunday. There the Huguenot refugees distinguished themselves by talent, virtue and industry. Not a few have risen to places of distinction in the army, and have helped to fight against French oppression in the Napoleonic wars. Strangely enough, the German Empire was proclaimed in the palace at Versailles, where the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes was signed.

I have brought with me as a curiosity a fac-simile of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; thinking it might be of interest to you. I do not believe there is another copy of it in this country, except the

one I gave to the Union Theological Seminary here. It has the signature of Louis XIV. I have also brought with me as a curiosity a copy of the massacre of *La Saint-Barthelemy*, by Henri Bordier, which has been so well described by our worthy President, with pictures of the massacre taken at the time.

There is a remarkable Nemesis in history. I have already alluded to the fact that the empire was proclaimed in the very place where the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes was signed. During the Franco-Prussian war Mr. Thiers, the celebrated statesman and historian, proceeded to the North of Europe to excite sympathy for France. He fell in with the German historian Leopold Von Ranke, who died a year ago in his 90th year, in the full possession of his faculties. He asked him what in the world are you fighting against? Are you fighting against the Emperor Napoleon? Ranke answered, No. Are you fighting against the Republic? No. Are you fighting against the French nation? Not at all. Against whom, then, are you fighting? We are fighting against Louis XIV. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes was deeply impressed on the memory of the German, but Thiers had forgotten all about it. The mills of the gods grind slowly, but exceedingly fine. The French Protestant church has chosen for its motto the burning bush, which is never consumed, and it is very characteristic of French Protestanism. We all know that the first Huguenot, we may say, at all events, the most distinguished, John Calvin, was born in France and driven from his native soil to find a home in the city of Geneva, and it was from this little city that the reformation was carried to France. Farel insisted upon his remaining there, and the consequences of his stay were momentous. He became the theologian organizer and disciplinarian of the French reformation. But one civil war after another followed the massacre of St. Bartholomew, until Henry of Navarre, known as Henry IV, renounced his faith to save his crown. His excuse was that Paris was worth a mass. The difficulty of this position was very great, the situation critical. He thought he could do the best service to his fellow religionists by granting them the toleration which they had not yet enjoyed. You all know the history of the Edict of Nantes, which we celebrate to-day. The Huguenots, as the French Protestants were called, surpassed their Catholic neighbors in industry and intelligence, and Louis XIV set in motion the most disgraceful persecution, which at last resulted in the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes 100 years after it had been issued, and drove the best citizens from their native land to make their homes in various countries. They went to Germany, Switzerland and Holland, and from these various countries they came to this country, and you all know the valuable Huguenot blood that flows in the veins of the American population.

Among the later arrivals in this country of the descendants of the Huguenots, I will mention Gallatin, Guyot and Agassiz, to the latter of

whom we owe a remark which our young men would do well to lay to heart: "I have no time to make money."

After the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes the Protestants were obliged to worship in forests, in the silence of the heaths; they were deprived of civil and religious rights, and constantly exposed to persecution and death; but they survived the danger, and are at this day a living power in France. They now enjoy religious liberty.

There is a great difference between toleration and liberty. Liberty is an unalienable right, liberty we claim as a gift of God. We tolerate a nuisance, if we cannot avoid it. We claim liberty as a right, just as freely as we claim the right of speech, the right of the pursuit of life and happiness.

This is the great advance that America has made upon the Edict of Nantes. We have a charter of liberty, everybody is allowed here, no one can interfere with a man in his relationship to God. Congress shall make no laws to prohibit the free exercise of the liberty of conscience.

The President then said: The last speaker of this evening is a direct descendant of Huguenot ancestors and a Vice-President of the Society, representing one of the earliest Huguenot centres.

I may perhaps add, without impropriety, that his speeches, always American, seem to recall traits attributed by historians to the Huguenots of France. We are told not only of their sturdy adherence to lofty principles, and of their devotion to manly utterance, public education and the just independence of individual judgment, but of their vivid and graceful force, of a certain chivalric and cultivated tone of a trained vitality and a superior success, and the Spectator of Addison speaks in Addison's melodious English of "the engaging joyousness of the gentle strangers."

I have the honor to introduce to you, the Honorable Chauncey M. Depew.

Mr. Depew spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:—

It is very difficult to rise to the occasion after such a complimentary introduction. The Chairman inspires an expectation beyond attainment.

Nothing better illustrates the characteristics of the Huguenots than our gathering here to-night. We differ radically in the form and spirit of our celebrations from the other nationalities who make up the American people. They always close their national anniversaries and the natal days of their patron saints with a banquet, and I occasionally attend them. There is in their history so much that is joyful and inspiring, that, the festive strain pervades their speech and song. The causes of their hilarity is the record and the repetition of the victories of their ancestors and their share in the glories of their ancient

homes and race. But the Huguenot gathering is serious, devotional, almost sad. We have no banquet. No national anthem or triumphant notes are heard at our meetings. The causes and results of our organization and dispersion are profoundly discussed. We are more reminiscent than prophetic, and never show the pardonable boastfulness of national anniversaries. Through our orations and poems run the mournful strains which have survived the hundred years struggle of our ancestors for liberty and life, and their heroic endurance in prison, torture, exile and death.

There is another peculiarity about the Huguenots, and that is their modesty. If you were present as I am at the anniversaries of all nationalities, you would know what I mean. Go to the annual dinner of the Irish, the Dutch, the Scotch, the English or the Welsh, and you will find from their orators, that each has done more for the world in general and America in particular than all the others combined. It is time we followed their examples and asserted ourselves. In these busy and progressive times, self negation is oblivion, and self assertion essential to the simple equilibrium of one's rightful relations to his peers. If we may not refer in glorious terms to country and kindred of the time when our ancestors were forced to become homeless wanderers, we can point with pride to what our people have done for every country which has harbored them. The peace and progress, the culture and enlightenment of nations is largely due to the teachings and example of the Huguenots.

Many streams have fertilized the soil of American liberty, but the three great sources of our institutions, and their expansive, receptive and assimilating power, were the Puritans, the Dutch and the Huguenot. How marvellously divergent are their histories, their memories and their development. The Dutchman came to New York to better his material condition. He was seeking a home, pecuniary independence and wealth. His battle for civil and religious liberty had been won. He did not need an asylum. He had rescued a country from the sea and made it free. Though few in number and fighting against fearful odds, they had curbed the conquests of Louis the Fourteenth. When defeated by overwhelming forces, they had still preserved their freedom by indomitable courage and able diplomacy. They had made and kept Holland the sanctuary of learning and preserver of the intellectual life of the century. There peoples of all creeds received hospitable welcome and toleration. The ships which brought them to Manhattan Island were part of that invincible fleet which had swept the English channel with brooms at their masts' head.

The Puritans also can claim a common heritage in centuries of triumph for English arms, and renown for English letters. The Pilgrims in the Mayflower were fugitives from civil and religious persecution. But the great body of the Puritans were state builders. Their

cause was victorious at home. Their compatriots had executed Charles the First and banished his son. The reign of Cromwell was the triumph of their faith. Their principles were imbedded in the British Constitution and British liberty expanded to protect them. The best places in English statesmanship, arms and literature belong to them. Their descendants can point with honest enthusiasm to their ancient homes and revisit them with pleasure.

But the Huguenots became at once men without a country. The conditions of their exile made it impossible for them ever to return. Their houses were destroyed, their property confiscated, and their kindred sent to the galleys or murdered. Their country proscribed and disowned them for no crime, but loving God in their own way and worshiping Him as their consciences dictated. With the Dutchmen and the Puritans, the great mass of their people remained under the parent government, but the Huguenots were excluded from France. They fled to Germany, to England, to Switzerland and America. They were naked in power, protection and property. There was no government to which they could appeal, and they could never go back to their native land. They were alone in strange countries, among people alien in blood and language. Pityfully and prayerfully they appealed to their neighbors. We have lost our relatives, our rights, our property. Adopt us as your brethren. We will fight in your armies, share with you our culture, be loyal to your institutions and give you the benefit of our skill and industry. We will prove by our devotion that we know of no kin, no blood, no country but yours, now ours for ever more. They became better Germans, English and Swiss than those to the manor born. Friendship is familiar with loans known as Kathleen Mavourneens, because they may be for a year and they may be forever. But the promises of the Huguenots were repaid annually and with ever compounding interest. They taught the Germans the secrets of their marvellous skill as artisans and mechanics, and created for that people new and fruitful industries. The Huguenot professors were the most learned and liberal teachers in Europe. They had made the French colleges the most famous in the world. They were cordially welcomed by the German faculties and their appearance in the universities was an important factor in the wonderful development and vigor of the German schools. They gave to England the manufactures which were the wealth and hope of France, and which made England for centuries mistress of the world. But quite as great as their contribution to England's power and material progress, was the value of their influence upon English character and traits. The Huguenots were humorous, cheerful, alert and harmonious. Whether nobles or peasants, gentle or humble, they had the graces of Christian politeness. The English common people of that period were the reverse. They were hard drinkers, brawlers

and fighters. There was the cruelest brutality in their sports, and the coarser elements of a conquering race were only manifest. The Huguenot colonists settled in simple wonder among their rough neighbors, who regarded them as too weak for assault, and ascribed their gentleness to cowardice. But it was proved on numberless battle-fields that the Huguenots with Christian courage advanced undismayed to the breach from which the bravest veterans had fled, or stood like a wall against the onset of the enemy which had scattered the best regiments in the army. Gradually the refinement, the culture, and consideration for others which characterized these adopted children impressed the whole household. Their industry commanded respect, their skill admiration, their unassuming piety reverence. Their steadfast faith and invincible bravery made clear to the dullest mind the grand distinction between the bully and bold man. Their influence was very great upon English refinement and manners.

There are few mistaken policies of government in ancient and none in modern history which were so pregnant with lasting results. The expulsion of the Huguenots was both a blunder and a crime. To it may be traced most of the misfortunes of France. A million of citizens, about one tenth of the population, were violently torn out of the state. They possessed much of the virtue, industry, intelligence and education of France. The forces left behind to combat corruption, immorality, tyranny, bigotry and ignorance were wholly inadequate. The discrepancy was so great that in the generations following, the heredity of the bad was out of all proportion to the heredity of the good. It became not a question of religion, for all religion became unpopular, but of civilization. Revolt against unendurable wrongs resulted not in stable government, but savage butcheries, and the mockery of faith and liberty. Had the Huguenot millions remained and multiplied, the Huguenot colleges been fostered and protected, the healthy antagonisms of creeds, and the expansion and activity of all churches which come from religious toleration been encouraged, France would have escaped the horrors of the French revolution and the Napoleonic nightmare. The uprising of her people would have been the calm judgment and wise action of a nation determined to be free and capable of founding an enduring Republic.

The Huguenot communities were famous for their industry and comparative wealth. It cost less to govern them and they contributed most in taxes. They were models of order, sobriety, and good citizenship. They made the greatest sacrifices, and applied their earnings first to build a church and then a school-house. They believed in education and the open Bible. They believed that the Word of God should be read in the light of the widest research and highest intelligence, and that thus God illumined the soul with a correct understanding of the truth. The Huguenots were the

only absolutely tolerant religionists of their time. They held that all Christian faiths had some portion of the Divine Spirit, and should have full liberty to follow their lights. They abhorred proscription for opinions sake, and in New Amsterdam received into their households and churches, the condemned witches fleeing from Connecticut.

All of the many nationalities which have settled in this country have contributed their due share to our developement and power. But for the present our theme is the portions which the Huguenots furnished of that magnificent mosaic, the Republic of the United States. Chivalrous courtesy, refinement of manner and speech, thirst for knowledge, public spirit, equal liberty of opinions and their expression for every one, and polite consideration and tolerance of an antagonist's faith or politics, that is Huguenot. The Huguenot spirit is the life of the American church, with its many creeds and single aim. It makes possible the partizanship which submits to government by majorities. The three first Presidents of the Continental Congress inspired that august body of revolutionists with their faith in an over-ruling Providence, their hopeful, cheerful, steadfast courage, their sublime trust in the triumph of the right, which had survived all their trials and sufferings. They gave to that greatest of tribunals, the Supreme Court of the United States, its first Chief Justice. Through him was impressed upon its origin and traditions the Huguenot ideas of justice. It over-rules President and Congress; it is a bulwark against the popular passions of the hour; it regulates and represses gigantic corporations, and recognizes and protects the right of the humblest individuals. It is the impregnable fortress of constitutional liberty.

The Huguenots of Massachusetts and South Carolina, exhibit under diverse conditions the vitality and vigor of their common characteristics. The New England Bowdoin gave his services to his country and his fortune to science and learning. He founded a college, the first of its kind, and organized the first humane society. Huguenot patriotism for the land of their adoption, Huguenot love for education and for mankind were exemplified in every act of his beautiful and beneficent life. The South Carolina Marion and his men were the romantic figures of the revolution. Bold riders, hard hitters, impetuous fighters, but generous and forgiving to a fallen foe. Their sufferings were forgotten and their wrongs not recalled in the hour of triumph. The passions of the battle were calmed with the victory. In the darkest period of his career, when his farm had been ravaged, his house burned, his stock stolen, his family scattered and a price put upon his head, Marion appeared suddenly in the South Carolina convention when that body was about passing a law expelling the Tories from the state and confiscating their property. As imperiously and impetuously as if charging the enemy, he called a halt and defeated the

enactment, by a memorable and soldierly speech. "Gentlemen," said he, "you can pass no such law. It is not the spirit of American liberty. We are going to win this fight and drive the invaders from our soil. We will keep these people among us, protect them in their estates and rights, and make them good citizens." That was the Huguenot spirit. When Grant at Appomattox gave back to Lee his sword, and paroled his army to go home and cultivate their property and their patriotism, it was the flowering after a century, of the spirit of the Huguenot of the revolution. It was the Huguenot spirit which welcomed back the states in rebellion to the equal privileges of our common liberty, and which to-day holds in our Union cemented with the blood of our bravest and best, a united people, one in their patriotism and aspirations.

The Society then tendered a vote of thanks to all the speakers for their addresses and requested copies of the same for publication.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF AMERICA

APRIL 20TH, 1888, TO APRIL 13TH, 1891

VOLUME II

PRINTED FOR THE SOCIETY
BY AUTHORITY OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1891

This volume of papers and proceedings of THE HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF AMERICA, has been printed by order of the Executive Committee, under the direction of the Publication Committee.

J. K. REES, *Chairman.*
P. B. OLNEY.
ALLAN MARQUAND.

88501

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

THE HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF AMERICA AND COLUMBIA COLLEGE. By John Jay, LL.D. 1

THE HUGUENOTS OF THE "DÉSERT." By Henry M. Baird, D.D., LL.D. .. 8

THE CAREER AND TIMES OF NICHOLAS BAYARD. By Mrs. Martha J. Lamb. 27

THE HISTORIC CELEBRATION OF THE VAUDOIS 58

PHILIP FRENEAU, THE HUGUENOT PATRIOT POET OF THE REVOLUTION, AND HIS POETRY. By Edward F. de Lancey 66

HISTORY OF THE EDICT OF NANTES. By Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D. 85

WAIFS AND STRAYS OF AMERICAN HISTORY. By Edward Wakefield 115

THE BAYARD FAMILY OF AMERICA, AND JUDGE BAYARD'S LONDON DIARY OF 1795–96. By Gen. Jas. Grant Wilson 135

THE RETRIBUTION OF LOUIS XIV. By James W. Gerard, LL.D 155

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS 179

THE HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF AMERICA AND COLUMBIA COLLEGE.*

By John Jay, LL.D., *President of Huguenot Society.*

Ladies and Gentlemen: The Huguenot Society of America meets this evening for the first time in these classic halls of Columbia College, and it is a fitting opportunity to express, as I now beg leave to do, on behalf of the Society, our grateful acknowledgments to Dr. Barnard, the very learned and illustrious retiring president, and to the distinguished trustees of this ancient and venerable institution, for the ready and friendly courtesy with which they have extended to us the hospitalities of the college, in giving place to our library and facilities for our work.

It is a graceful recognition of the dignity and value of the aims of this Society, and of the extent to which the history of the college, and yet more of the City of New York, whose learning and culture, statesmanship and enterprise, the roll of Columbia so honorably represents, have been for two and a half centuries identified with the Huguenot element. That element, in the words of Dr. Storrs, added to the Dutch and English population "a vivid and graceful force," "a certain chivalric and cultivated tone," "an ancestral influence of education, refinement, and skilful enterprise as well as of religious fidelity;" an element whose "trained vitality made it efficient," and whose story, the more it is unfolded, illustrates "the value and vigor of the force which they imparted to the early American life."

Dr. Baird, to whom we are to have the pleasure of listening this evening, and whose careful study of Huguenot history is recognized on both sides of the Atlantic, in remarking upon the revocation of the Edict of Nantes as the instrument in the

* Read before the Huguenot Society, November 15th, 1888.

hands of a higher power, supplying one of those essential elements of our new American civilization, has strikingly said of the Huguenot element :

"I have somewhere seen it likened to the gold which the pious Russians cast into the molten mass that was to become the great bell of the cathedral of Moscow ; what the Huguenots added to our American commonwealth did not greatly augment its bulk, nor, possibly, make any essential change in its leading characteristics, but it requires no extraordinary keenness to detect the superior fineness of tone, the clearer and more melodious ring which the admixture imparted."

The influence of the Huguenot element in New York, not simply by the refined and chivalric traits alluded to by Dr. Storrs, but especially in its devotion to common schools and higher education, to religious liberty and civil freedom, can be traced both in the foundation and the teachings of this institution. While the memory of the Huguenots lives in the national and State records, the legislation, the judicature and the diplomacy of the republic : while New Jersey cherishes the fame of Boudinot, and the South rejoices in the names of Laurens, Marion and Pettigrew, and Maine points with pride to Bowdoin College, and Massachusetts with affection to Faneuil Hall, Columbia College may, with equal pride and affection, point to her original charter and her historic roll, and to the exemplification by her sons of Huguenot descent, of the characteristics of that heroic race.

Its charter, exhibiting the Christian character of its founders —Catholic for the truth of God and thoroughly Protestant against the errors of man—appointed as trustees " the Rector of Trinity, the senior minister of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, the minister of the ancient Lutheran Church, the minister of the Presbyterian Congregation, and the minister of *the French* (*the Huguenot*) *Church*." Among the principal gentlemen of the city added in the charter, we find the names of Oliver and James De Lancey, Paul Richard, Leonard Lispenard, Philip Verplanck and others of Huguenot descent. The charter of King's College, given by George II. on the 31st of October, 1754, was intended to promote a liberal education among his loving

subjects, "and to make the same as beneficial as may be,"—mark the length and breadth of the royal foundation,—"not only to the inhabitants of the said Province of New York, but to all our colonies and territories in America." That royal intention, so emphatically declared in the act of its creation, makes it clear that the college was to be neither municipal nor provincial in its character, but that its beneficial influence was to be American, extending to all the British colonies and territories on the continent; and this grand feature seems to add another reason for a perfect harmony of thought and influence between Columbia as a Christian American university and the Huguenot Society of America. The original charter was witnessed by "our trusty and well-beloved James De Lancey, our Lieutenant Governor and Commander-in-Chief of our Province of New York and the territories depending thereon in America."

A representative of that distinguished family, who is happily present this evening, Mr. Edward F. De Lancey, is the Vice-President for New York of the Huguenot Society, which finds itself at home to-night in this ancient college, whose roll is so suggestive of historic memories that are cherished with pride by all true Americans. A simple glance at the record shows the number and prominence of the Huguenot names, which, if modified perhaps in sound and spelling by their transit and translation through Holland to America, represent unchanged the Huguenot spirit. For many of those names are identified with the learning, science, law and literature; with the learned professions, the intellectual, moral and scientific progress of the republic, and with every honorable phase of its political and diplomatic history.

One of the most notable features in the history of King's College is that, although Dr. Myles Cooper, who succeeded as president in 1763, was an avowed and decided Tory, with views so distinctly offensive to the Liberal party that in 1775 he deemed it prudent to escape by night and take refuge on board of an English vessel, the religious teachings and liberal studies of the college, despite the political principles that prevailed among the governors, had awakened so intelligent a love of liberty, and so just an appreciation of English law, that a large

proportion of its pupils were among the foremost champions of American rights; and the solid culture of King's was conspicuous in the arguments which Dr. Samuel Johnson attempted in vain to answer by his "Taxation no Tyranny," and in the papers of the Colonial Congress, which Lord Chatham said exhibited a force of sagacity and a wisdom of conclusion unparalleled since the days of Thucydides.

It is easy now to trace that devotion to civil liberty, and to the spirit of religious freedom from which it naturally flows, that obtained, with a happy freedom from sectarian bigotry and intolerance, in the New Netherlands as in its mother land. The religious freedom that prevailed among the Dutch, and which was transplanted to New Netherlands, was, as Brodhead says, neither a political expedient nor the tenet of any state necessity. "It was," in the words of De Witt, "the instinct and habit, and traditional law of right in the heart of the nation, the observance of which they could boast with honest pride for ages."

The State favored no inquisition into the faith or religious principles of any peaceable man who came to live under the protection of their laws; and so naturally representatives of the noblest blood, the highest culture and the purest Christianity of Europe were attracted to New Netherlands as the home of that religious freedom which lies at the basis of civil liberty and the most enlightened civilization. To Holland went the English Puritans, who, after eleven years' residence in Holland, proposed to go to the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam, and found a refuge at Plymouth Rock. Hither came with the Hollanders, Walloons from the Spanish Netherlands; Waldenses from Piedmont, whose fathers had escaped the massacres on which Milton invoked God's vengeance; long persecuted Jews from Portugal; English, Scotch and Irish; Norwegians, Swedes and Swiss; English Quakers; German Reformers; the Salzburg exiles; the Moravian Brothers; refugees from the Palatinate, Alsace and South Germany; but most of all, came in force the Huguenots from France. French families of this faith were found here as early as 1625; and in 1638 they constituted so substantial a part of the population that Johannes La Mon-

tagne, a Huguenot of learning and culture, who had arrived the year before, was associated in the government with William Kieft, and the public documents were printed equally in French and Dutch. Nor should it be forgotten that that little colony of Dutch and French is believed to have been the first in America by which public schools were established, under the wise system of the Hollanders, at the public expense,—the first schoolmaster, Adam Rollandsen, having arrived from Holland in 1633.

The origin in this State of that system of public schools, which is recognized alike by friends and foes as the bulwark of our Republic, and which the Jesuits are endeavoring to destroy on the pretense that they are unchristian and heathenish, throws light upon the Christian character which from colonial times has marked our public schools, in fit accord with the judicial decisions that the tolerant Christianity of the Bible is the religion of the American people and a part of American law. The remonstrance of New Netherlands in 1649, against some illiberal features of the administration of Kieft and Stuyvesant (I. Brodhead, 506), insisted that "the youth be well taught and brought up, not only in reading and writing, but also in the knowledge and fear of the Lord,"—which accords with the later injunction in New England in regard to schools—words as significant as they are simple, "as near to God as may be." It was characteristic also of the clear intelligence and sound judgment of the people of New York that when in the first State Constitution they adopted the common law as it stood on the 29th of April, 1775, of which Christianity was a part, they were careful at the same time to ordain that "such parts of the common law as might be construed to establish or maintain any particular denomination of Christians or their ministers are hereby abrogated." So that while our common schools are bound to teach the ethics of Christianity, they are not to deal in sectarian doctrines or dogmas, and the State is forbidden to establish or maintain any particular denomination of Christians.

In recalling the history of King's College, we may remember that when in 1656, Domine Drisius had called the attention of

the West India Company to the advantage of a Latin school at New Amsterdam, it was suggested to the Amsterdam Chamber that the neighboring places would send their children here to be educated, and that New Amsterdam might "finally attain to an academy, whereby the place arriving at great splendor, your Honours shall have the reward and praise." Although neither Domine Drisius nor the Amsterdam Chamber may have fully anticipated the future splendor of New Amsterdam and its academy, we may fitly in this brief retrospect honor their memories for having thus early assisted to lay the foundation for their English and Huguenot successors of this institution whose courtesy we acknowledge, and whose plans for extending and enlarging its beneficial influence as an university, are observed by American scholars with increasing interest.

As touching our relations with our sister association, the Huguenot Society of London, in whose progress and valuable publications we have so deep an interest, I may say that during a recent visit to London I had the good fortune to meet its very able and distinguished President, the Right Honorable Sir Henry Austin Layard, G.C.B., on his return from the Continent, where he had recently prepared his important memoir on "the Massacre of St. Batholomew and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, illustrated by State papers in the archives of Venice," and Arthur Girard Browning, Esq., chief organizer of the society and now one of its vice-presidents. To these gentlemen I was especially indebted for their most cordial courtesy to me as the President of the Huguenot Society of America, and for their kind assurances of sympathy and regard and friendly co-operation. In England as in France the establishment and progress of the American society is watched with unusual interest.

In London I was also honored with an invitation to dine with the governor and directors of the Hospital for Poor French Protestants and their descendants residing in Great Britain, which was incorporated by royal charter, 1718. The dinner was given at the institution on Victoria Park Road, which with its aged and respectable inmates is full of interest. In the absence of the governor, Lord Radnor, the chair was

occupied by the vice-president, Charles John Shoppee, Esq.; and among the company were Messrs. A. G. Browning, B. B. Portal, Nevill Jourdain, Reginald Stanley Faber, Rev. George Robinson, Chaplain; S. Wayland Kershaw, F. S. A., whose pleasant volume, entitled "Protestants from France in their English Homes," is in our library, with the striking motto from Sir Thomas Browne on its title-page: "They maintained their faith in the noble way of persecution and served God in the fire, whereas we honor him in the sunshine"; Thomas Archer and Gerald Augustine Shoppee,—all members of the Huguenot Society of London, and all most cordial and appreciative in their estimate of the work to be accomplished and the importance of co-operation.

I may add that the toasts, in accordance with the ancient usage of the hospital, were given in French, and that the charter soup served at these dinners was made from a recipe, with a copy of which I was favored for the use of our members, of the same date with the charter in 1718.*

You will now, ladies and gentlemen, have the pleasure of hearing Dr. Baird, on the Huguenots of the "Désert."

---

*The recipe is as follows: Provide shin of beef, about ten pounds; saw it into three pieces and take out marrow; strip the meat off the bones as closely as possible; put the bones immediately on to boil in about a gallon and a half of water; cut the meat into pieces and fry them brown in butter; after frying add them to the stock. Cut four large onions into slices and fry them brown and add to stock; also add two large carrots, two good-sized turnips, about twenty berries of allspice, some thyme and marjoram, and a little handful of parsley. Boil well for about eight hours, then strain the stock off clear and put by until next day. Skim off all the fat, put the soup on in stock-pot to melt, then take about three ounces of good salt butter and put in a stew-pan with about three-quarters of a pound of flour, mix it well together; when the stock boils, thicken it with the flour and butter; it must be brought to a boil then and strained through a fine sieve. The soup must be seasoned with cayenne, salt and a little ketchup. A small drum-head cabbage boiled in water and salt, and squeezed dry and cut into shreds, and a sufficient quantity put into the tureen and the boiling soup poured on it. This will serve for thirty guests.

Set on the great pot. 2 Kings, iv. 38.

THE FRENCH HOSPITAL, Incorporated by Royal Charter, A. D. 1718.

THE HUGUENOTS OF THE "DÉSERT."*

By Henry M. Baird, D.D., LL.D., *Professor in the University of the City of New York.*

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: — I am to speak to you of the Huguenots of the "Désert," or of the Huguenots during that period, exceeding a century by two years, which intervened between the publication of the Revocatory Edict by Louis XIV. in 1685 and the publication of the Edict of Toleration by Louis XVI. in 1787. First of all, a few words must be said respecting the designation of the period as that of the "Désert" or "Wilderness." So far as it lay in the power of the government, Protestantism had been abolished in France. All its religious exercises were absolutely forbidden. In city, town or village there was not one place of worship remaining. For years before the formal recall of the Edict of Nantes, the policy had been inexorably pursued of closing, upon some pretext or other (and the flimsiest of pretexts served the purpose quite as well as the best grounded), every *temple*, or Protestant church, within the realm. Almost all these "temples" had been taken away from the Huguenots before the final edict, but that iniquitous law effectually disposed of the few that had been spared. France had now become all Roman Catholic in the eye of the despotic monarch and his applauding court. The Huguenots were no longer dignified even with the opprobrious title of members of the "pretended Reformed religion." They were now the "New Converts"— "*Nouveaux Convertis*"—very badly converted, it might be, undisguised opponents of the practices, the faith, the hierarchy of the church to which they were reputed to belong — but nevertheless styled "New Converts," rather than "Reformed," because, after the autocratic edict of Louis XIV., it

* Read before the Huguenot Society November 15th, 1888.

was contrary to every principle of the servile courtiership of the day to admit that there existed any Protestants in France. Such as had been dragooned into once going to mass and were so weak as to humor their persecutors by going there again at rare intervals, were regarded as reasonably good and faithful children of Mother Holy Church; at any rate, what they lacked in fervor and sincerity it was the sanguine hope of the clergy would be amply made up by the devotion of their children in the next generation. It was forgotten that these very children would be nourished and brought up in secret hatred of the established Church, of whose cruelty they would in future years show themselves scarcely more forgiving than their parents had been. But there were many others whose conformity to the State religion was of the very narrowest kind, and who disguised the fact from no one that they were still Protestants at heart. It was not long before they began to meet for mutual consolation, for the secret reading of God's word, for prayer. Such gatherings being under the ban of the law, the utmost secrecy was observed. A retired house might answer the purpose at first, in case the number of persons frequenting the place was very small. But as soon as there began to be preachers, and a regular service, and the singing of the grand old historic psalms, as soon as the gathered Protestants began to be numbered by hundreds and by thousands, some spot offering more likelihood of safety was sought out — some glen in the mountains, some wood difficult of access to all but those who were in the secret, some remote sheep pasture or some deserted stone quarry. Here great assemblies might come together of men, women and children, each of whom took his life in his hands, not knowing at what moment a band of merciless soldiers, guided only too well by a purchased traitor, might burst in upon them, and a volley of musket-shots might interrupt the harmony of their praise. To the worshippers who thus, laboriously and at the risk of death or life-long imprisonment in monastery or at the oar in the crowded galley, made their way from Nismes, or Alais, or Uzès, into the wilds far from the habitations of men, their toilsome and perilous experience assumed a Scriptural type. They recalled the strange advent

of John the Baptist, "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, 'Prepare ye the way of the Lord!'" They likened their own experience to that of the ancient people of God, compelled to wander for forty years in the desert of Arabia. Most of all, as their minds turned instinctively to prophecy, they remembered that Apocalyptic vision of the woman clothed with the sun, who was to be persecuted by the great dragon, and who "fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God." Thus it was that the Huguenots of the end of the seventeenth century began to speak of their meetings, held in places which it was too hazardous to describe more definitely, and which, for fear of the enemy, only a very few persons were permitted to know until the very last moment, as convening "in the wilderness"—"*au Désert.*" The designation was adopted during the eighteenth century by friend and by foe; it was regularly employed by the ecclesiastical bodies, the colloquies and synods, in their minutes; and occasionally in the legal documents of the realm. I have even found the words, "Acts of the provincial synod of the Reformed Churches of Vivarais and Velay, assembled under the Divine protection in the *Désert*, in Upper Vivarais, on the 22d of May, 1788," at the head of the minutes of that body. As this was six months after the publication of the Edict of Toleration, the use of the formula may serve to show the affectionate regard that prevented the Huguenots from instantly dispensing with an appellation endeared to them by the constant use of an entire century.

I have chosen the Huguenots of the Désert as the subject of this paper, both because of the fact that this portion of the history of French Protestantism is less familiar to most readers of the records of the past, and because we may learn from it that the age of heroism is not so distant from us as we are apt to imagine. For over a hundred years, the Protestant religion was under the ban. Every measure had been taken to destroy it. It would tax the ingenuity of the most fertile imagination to invent more effectual means than those that were employed to accomplish this end. And yet when the day of toleration tardily dawned, when it was once more possible for the Prot-

estants to show their faces and claim their civil rights, men discovered to their amazement that the number of adherents to this communion was little, if at all, inferior to the number of the Huguenots before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, subtraction being made of the multitudes — three or four or five hundred thousand perhaps — that succeeded in reaching the hospitable shelter of Holland, of Switzerland, of Germany, of England, and of this country among others. The maintenance of Protestantism in France through so many years, under such difficulties, in the face of such formidable dangers, was a magnificent achievement, the more worthy of admiration that it called not so much for any single daring act in a sudden emergency, as for the quiet, persistent, relentless exercise of a resolution which nothing could daunt, nothing could turn aside from its purpose. This wonderful achievement was the work for the conscientious and successful execution of which the Huguenots of the period of the Désert are entitled to undying praise at our mouths, whether we can claim descent from them or we derive our birth from their more fortunate brethren, who defied the legislation of the "Grand Monarque" and made their way to happier lands.

The closing fifteen years of the seventeenth century—the years from 1685 to 1700—and the first fifteen years of the eighteenth century, were the most dismal part of the existence of the Huguenots. Although not annihilated, as their enemies expected them to be, they were dazed by the crushing blow they had received. Well used as they were to the endurance of injustice, they could not bring themselves to believe that the law revoking an edict guaranteed to them by the direct promises and assurances, so often repeated, of successive rulers, was a final resolution of the King. That amiable prince had been misinformed, misled, abused by his counsellors. He would, he must, repeal his unrighteous act, when his eyes were opened, when the friendly remonstrances of neighboring princes and States reached his throne, when the cries of the persecuted were at length permitted to enter his ears. It was natural for the Huguenots, even yet firm believers, for the most part, in the dangerous tenet that the king can do no

wrong, to look for better things in their own times,—in no distant future.

Meantime the ministers of the Gospel had been driven out of France. Their former flocks were left without a shepherd. The conditions were precisely those which would engender irregular religious manifestations, and accordingly they did engender them—not among the well-educated and intelligent men and women who had been wont to attend worship at Charenton or Caen, and had listened to the preaching of a Jean Claude or a Pierre du Bosc, nor in Poitou or Saintonge, seats of culture and ease, but among the rude peasantry of Vivarais and Dauphiny and the shepherds of the Cévennes Mountains, unused to letters. Here it was that the world was startled by hearing of strange sights and sounds. Here it was that circles of men, and especially women, meeting to read and meditate upon the prophecies of the Holy Scriptures, witnessed the sudden manifestations, as they thought, of the Divine Spirit revealing things to come. Young girls, and even small children, fell into a trance, and uttered predictions of the near approach of the day of deliverance, of the destruction of God's enemies, of the triumph of His elect. The shepherdess of Crest, a young peasant maiden, obtained a wide reputation through the southeast of France for her wonderful revelations. Royal intendants and priests, including Bishop Esprit Fléchier, of Nismes, whose interesting correspondence on the subject has come down to us, interfered, and by inquisitions and punishments attempted to stop the spread of the New Fanaticism, as they called it. But no means of forcible repression were of much avail, and the movement had to run its natural course. It was many years before the voice of the "prophets of the Cévennes," or the "little prophets," as they were popularly called, was silenced. Meanwhile the utterances of the fanatics, amid much that was self-deception and more that was probably pure imposture, had had at least the good effect of preventing the Protestants of this corner of France from lapsing into utter irreligion and unconcern; while the failure of the pretended prophets to make good their predictions had given the people a thirst for a more orderly and regular religious

organization, after the model of the times before the Revocation.

However, before that consummation could be attained, it was decreed that an attempt should be made in another form to re-establish Protestantism in France. Popular enthusiasm in connection with pretended revelations from Heaven having failed, it was next attempted to see what the force of arms could do.

The war of the Camisards is one of the most singular and romantic episodes of Huguenot history. Although the conflict lasted only two years—from 1702 to 1704—this short struggle is invested with an interest as deep as belongs to that of any other popular movement directed against ecclesiastical and secular despotism. Like many another, this war arose not in accordance with a carefully laid plan, but in the circumstances of the hour, from the desperation of men whose righteous indignation has been long and severely tried and at length breaks through the bands of ordinary prudence and purpose. The Abbé du Chayla, stationed at Pont de Montvert (a village that now boasts some sixteen hundred inhabitants, and probably had about the same number at the beginning of the last century), was no ordinary spiritual shepherd—least of all the model country parson, with heart aglow with tenderness and love for his flock. Appointed inspector-general of missions in the diocese of Mende, he had for seventeen years been discharging the office of an inquisitor in the whole region of the Cévennes Mountains with a zeal and with a ferocity that would have done no discredit to a Torquemada. The first blow of the Camisard war was struck when a band of forty or fifty men, who had themselves been the victims of his savage cruelty, or who had witnessed the wretchedness which he had inflicted upon their nearest relatives, attacked his house with the view of liberating the captives known to be there. At that very time, according to the admission of his apologist, Louvreleuil, there were imprisoned in the cellar of his manse—held fast in the clutches of a curiously devised instrument of torture which permitted the victim neither to sit nor to stand, and inflicted upon him the most exquisite pain—three young

men and three girls reserved for still greater punishment for the frightful crime of attempting to leave France without the king's permission, in the hope of reaching some place where they might freely worship God!* The assailants, we are assured, had only intended to free the prisoners; but no sooner had they gotten their arch-enemy into their power than an uncontrollable desire of revenge gained possession of them. It took but a few moments to dispatch the blood-thirsty abbé, covered with a multitude of wounds. "Here," said one as he struck him with his knife, "here is for your violent treatment of my father." "Here," said another, "for what you did to my mother, my brother, or my sister." "Here," said others, "for condemning such a man to the galleys." "Here," said others, "for ruining such a family," or "for securing the condemnation of So-and-so to death."

I shall not stop to describe the incidents of the war of which the attack upon the Abbé du Chayla was the opening chapter. It must suffice to say that when the Protestant mountaineers of the Cévennes took the field, these untrained troops, under the leadership of men taken from the lowest ranks of society, made themselves feared and respected by the best forces which the King could send against them. Even the most experienced and distinguished of royal generals were not ashamed to treat on equal terms with the Huguenot Roland, and Catinat and Cavalier, and it only depended upon these humble men to obtain for themselves the most enviable advantages, if they would but abandon the cause for which they had drawn the sword.

The Camisard war ended, as was inevitable, with the complete subjection of the insurgents; but its conclusion did not much precede an event far less conspicuous, yet of far more world-wide importance—the resurrection of the French Protestant Church from the grave in which it had been lying apparently lifeless for the space of thirty years.

The one year 1715 witnessed *three* events of far more than ordinary importance in the history of the Huguenots. The

---

* Louvreleuil, Le fanatisme renouvelé, I. 33, and Court, Hist. des Camisards, I. 26.

first was the publication of the most savage law in all the cruel legislation against them. The second was the death of their arch-persecutor, Louis XIV. The third was the initial but decisive step taken to rear anew their prostrate churches. Let us for a moment look at each of these events.

First the law. On the 8th of March, 1715, Louis XIV. issued his last enactment regarding the Protestants. The object was to make every Protestant, who in his last illness should refuse the sacraments of the Roman Catholic Church, liable to the penalties pronounced upon "relapsed" persons, that is, persons who having been once converted to Roman Catholicism had returned to their former so-called heretical opinions. The penalties to be inflicted upon such persons had been prescribed in another and previous declaration of April 26th, 1686. They were in brief that the bodies of relapsed persons should, after death, be thrown, like the carcasses of unclean beasts, upon hurdles, dragged through the filth of the streets, and having been denied any form of Christian burial, —indeed, of human burial,—at last be consigned—refuse of the earth that they were—to the common sewer. That the surviving family might not only suffer ignominy, but positive loss, the property of the relapsed was forfeited to the State. Now, why should the Huguenots, many of them persistent Protestants, who in point of fact had never abjured their faith, and could not therefore, it would seem, in any sense have relapsed, be treated by the new law as relapsed persons? Were they not the very class of men and women to whom the assurance had been given, in the Edict of Revocation itself, that they might continue to reside safely and without molestation in their former homes? The reasons assigned were dishonest enough, and quite in keeping with the tricky and disingenuous legislation of which the Huguenots were the constant victims. First, it was stated to be hard, and in many cases impossible, to obtain sufficient proof of abjurations that had taken place many years before, often in distant parts of the kingdom, and at a time when, in the hurry of the moment, the records were irregularly and imperfectly kept. The other reason, to translate the King's own words, was "that the sojourn which those

who were of the so-called Reformed religion, or were born of Protestant parents (*parens religionnaires*), have made in our kingdom since we abolished all exercise of the said religion therein, is proof more than sufficient that they have embraced the Roman Catholic and Apostolic religion, *without which thing they would not have been suffered or tolerated therein!*" It was a palpable untruth, another and the last reiteration by Louis XIV. of his success in overthrowing Protestantism—the lying sentiment expressed upon one of the medals struck in honor of the Revocation, "*Hæresis extincta*," and the assertion of another medal that two millions of Calvinists had been brought back into the bosom of the papal Church.

The "Grand Monarque" may be said to have died with this falsehood upon his lips. The law against obstinate Huguenots was signed, as has been said, on the 8th of March, 1715; Louis XIV. died on the 1st of September of the same year. He died, apparently believing that he had completely succeeded in doing the work of exemplary piety urged upon him by Père la Chaise, and that Protestantism was forever a thing of the past. Yet we are told that the darkest hour is that which immediately precedes the dawn. In the brief interval that elapsed between the publication of the infamous law of which I have just spoken and Louis XIV.'s death, the very period when the deepest gloom hung over the fortunes of French Protestantism, the first crepuscular rays, harbingers of an approaching sunrise, struck the eyes of those almost disheartened watchers who still hoped almost against hope that the orb of day might yet again shine upon France. It was upon the 21st of August, 1715, eleven days before Louis XIV. breathed his last in the palace of Versailles, surrounded by every form of magnificence, that Antoine Court, son of a peasant, himself a homeless and proscribed preacher, gathered in a deserted quarry, near the village of Monoblet, in Lower Languedoc, the few Protestant workers, men over whose heads a sword not less fatal than that of Damocles was suspended, and organized the first Synod of the churches of the Désert. To Antoine Court justly belongs the proud title of the Restorer of French Protestantism.

He was of humble and obscure parentage, and saw the light of day about the year 1696. His Protestant father and mother had destined him, even before his birth, to the Christian ministry. But as the former died when Antoine was but four or five years old, and the latter was left a poor widow, burdened with several small children, there was little likelihood of the fulfilment of parental hopes. Happily Antoine was bright, studious, and from the start a devoted Protestant. His aversion to Roman Catholicism took concrete form in his boyhood, we may judge from his extant autobiography, chiefly in a hatred of the mass, which he tells us he "detested with all his heart." Of this he once gave a somewhat amusing illustration. Four of his schoolmates, noticing that he never set foot in the village church, resolved to take him thither by main force. For this purpose they ran after him, and overtaking him upon the stairs of his house, undertook to carry their plan into execution. They found it no easy task. The boy clung with desperation to each successive step. He could not have fought more resolutely, had his life depended on the issue of the struggle. In the end his assailants drew off discomfited, but Antoine Court had made himself thoroughly disliked. Not only children, but full-grown men derisively shouted at him on the street, "There goes Calvin's eldest son!" "*Au fils aîné de Calvin!*"

It is needless here to detail the steps by which Court, at the age of only seventeen, and in the great dearth which then prevailed of persons able in any capacity to encourage and exhort their persecuted brethren, was led to assume the duties of a preacher, committing to memory the sermons of approved ministers, and reciting them in the small meetings which convened, with fear and trembling, in retired places and often at dead of night. He had, however, a more important work to do than this. With a discernment wonderful in one so young, he saw in the fanaticism of those who pretended to have visions from heaven and to be endowed with prophetic gifts still greater impediments to the progress of Protestantism, than in the persecution to which its professors were exposed. And it was with the view of suppressing the irregular and

injurious activity of the "inspired," not less than of giving form and consistency to the government and administration of the churches, that he labored for months with pertinacious zeal, until he at length succeeded in bringing together the assembly to which reference has already been made. It was a most unpretending gathering, of which the lad who acted both as presiding officer and as secretary had not reached his twentieth year. Yet, as the first of a long series of synods stretching over the entire remainder of the eighteenth century and to the very verge of the century in which we live—as the meeting at which was roughly drawn the sketch of a great movement that was, before the fall of the Bourbon dynasty, to spread over the entire kingdom, and reclaim a great part of the ground once held by the Reformation, the "synod" in the deserted quarry of Monoblet, where the seats of the nine members and the secretary's table were rude blocks of stone, assumes an importance not second to that of the most pompous assembly of the clergy of the State church in the cathedral of Sens, or the palace of the Archbishop of Paris.

It is not my purpose on the present occasion to speak at length respecting the very interesting Synods of the Désert, whose minutes it is now possible to study in detail, since M. Edmund Hugues has given them to the world in three magnificent quarto volumes, of which the last was issued from the press early in 1887. A glimpse at their contents, and especially at some of the representations by photogravure of such early originals as have come down to us, will give an impression of the heroism of those who took part in their deliberations, more vivid than any which I could hope to convey by any words of mine. Here, the art which compels the sun's rays to do office in exactly reproducing the records of a former age, has placed before our eyes the very counterpart of the loose sheet of paper on which the scribe had compressed the transactions of the meeting. Dangerous paper this, to write or to have in one's possession,—a paper that might serve as a very passport, needing no addition of countersign or *visé*, to conduct him upon whose person it might be found straight to prison and galleys, or—more likely still—to death by hang-

ing or by being broken upon the wheel. I remember that L'Estoile, in his journal somewhere, tells us of his having burned a certain libel during the time of the League, "lest it should burn him." Well, the minutes I am speaking of, give evidence of belonging just to that dangerous kind of literature —a kind of which it would be quite as well for a disguised *pasteur du Désert* when overhauled by Bâville's guards not to be found possessed—compact enough when folded (the marks of the fold are there) to go easily into the sole of the shoe or into the lining of the coat. And yet, what eloquence there is in those tell-tale bits of paper, often no larger than a man's hand—what incidental allusions to perilous, truly manly and Christian work, work done quietly and unostentatiously, work not only unrewarded here below according to its deserts, but requited with ignominious death.

And how was this body of heroic men recruited? It was manifestly impossible to look abroad for candidates for so perilous a ministry. Few men, if any, would deem it their duty to enter a service whose labors were so constant and ill-paid, and the discharge from which was not unfrequently through a martyr's death. Moreover, the conditions were such that a stranger unacquainted with the geography of the country, the towns and villages, the roads and rivers, the woods and mountains and fords—above all, unfamiliar with the manners and customs of the inhabitants—could scarcely hope to escape for a single month the vigilant eye of the government agents, with a multitude of clerical spies of all grades, only too ready to denounce any suspicious person.

And yet the Huguenots of the Désert must have an educated ministry, as their fathers had had one ever since the first dawn of the Reformation.

To secure it they early lighted upon this method. If within the bounds of any synod there were discovered boys or young men of earnest character and of good parts, showing a readiness to devote themselves to the ministry, they were placed under the charge of some one of the pastors who had the greatest aptitude for teaching. But this pastor, like all his brethren, led a roving life, scarcely remaining two consecutive

days in the same town or village lest his presence should become known to the enemy, concealing himself by day and often travelling long distances in the disguise of a trader or a pedlar, sleeping on the bleak mountain-side much more frequently than in a comfortable house, and accustomed to rest as contentedly upon a bed of moss and twigs of trees as on a bed of down. His pupils had to share his fortunes and become inured to the hardship which he supported. The preparatory school for the study of theology from its migratory habits was well named "*école ambulante.*"

Antoine Court, in one of his reminiscences, gives us a charming little pen-picture of such an institution, as primitive in its appointments as the university which the fancy of the lamented Garfield created, with Mark Hopkins upon one end of a log and the solitary student upon the other, and all around an unbroken wilderness. The Huguenot preacher is describing a scene in his own life in the Désert:

"I had our field-beds spread by the side of a torrent, and underneath a rock. . . . Here we encamped nearly a week; this was our lecture room, these were our grounds, these our rooms for study. In order that our time might not be wasted, and that our candidates might gain practice, I assigned them a passage of Sacred Scripture to comment upon. It was the first eleven verses of the fifth chapter of Saint Luke. They were not allowed to communicate their views to each other, nor to use other helps than the Bible. In the hours of recreation I propounded to them now a doctrinal point to explain, now a passage of Scripture, or a moral precept, or I gave them passages to harmonize. And this is the plan I pursued. As soon as I had proposed the question, I asked the youngest for his opinion, and then the rest in turn until I reached the eldest. When each one had expressed his sentiments, I again addressed the youngest, asking him whether he had not an objection to offer to the opinions of the others, and so I passed from one to another. All having argued, I gave them my own views respecting the subject proposed. When their exercises were ready, a pole was placed upon two forked sticks, and this served as a pulpit for preaching. Whenever one of the young men

resigned it, I asked all to state what they had noticed, observing the method given above."

Such a school might serve the purpose of a preparatory school, but for the higher branches of a theological education the candidates must go elsewhere. But whither should they go? At Geneva there was a university, the famous "Académie" founded by Calvin; and to its theological department the young men from the Désert might have been sent. But Geneva was too near the French borders, and was much too fearful of the armies of Louis, to be hospitable to the youth whose avowed intention it was to return and preach the gospel in France, in the very teeth of the King's commands. Besides, the instruction given at Geneva was too scholastic, the time of study too protracted, to suit the case of the candidates sent at the expense of the poor Protestants of France. It was necessary to found a new institution, the more unpretending the better, at a place somewhat less conspicuous than Geneva. It was at Lausanne then that the theological school of the churches of the Désert was established. An obscure room or two in a back street were all the outward signs of its existence, with three or four instructors, pastors of churches or professors in the State university, performing this service as a pure labor of love, and with a handful of poor lads deriving a meagre support from such sums as at irregular intervals came to them from the other side of the Jura Mountains, or from the occasional collections made in their behalf by the benevolent of Germany and Switzerland. All this was very small, almost contemptible. But, gentlemen, what is small, what is contemptible, becomes invested with importance and honor when poverty and privation link themselves to the accomplishment of great moral designs. What has induced that ill-clothed, under-fed young man, whose touching letters to his family in France may have fallen under your eyes, to come to Lausanne and undergo so much want and hardship? Is it the prospect of honorable distinction, ease or wealth? So far from it, he is educating himself for a career than which few could be supposed to offer less to allure the imagination or to gratify the ambition of men. The theological school of the Désert at Lausanne is well designated in the

expressive words of Michelet, as "that strange school of death, which, while it forbade an exaggerated enthusiasm (*l'exaltation*) in a modest and prosaic way, never tired of sending forth martyrs and of furnishing food for the scaffold to fatten upon."

The heroism displayed by the Huguenots of the Désert was not, however, let us remember it, confined to the pastors who had devoted themselves to their perilous undertaking. Simple men taken from the lowest ranks set a precious example which the highest might well have emulated. If the veteran minister Jacques Roger, when asked by the officer sent to arrest him what his name was, could answer with perfect composure, "I am he whom you have been seeking for six-and-thirty years; it was high time you found me," the plain peasant Roque, falsely accused of having, single-handed, undertaken to rescue seven Huguenot women from the hands of a detachment of soldiers that was escorting them, so conducted himself before his execution as to amaze both friends and foes by the aptness of his repartees. An over-zealous abbé, noticing Roque's rejection of the spiritual consolation offered by some dozen or more of monks, took the poor Huguenot by the collar with both his hands, and bade him remember that within two hours he would appear in the presence of his Maker, and that, being in a damnable religion, it was impossible but that, if he did not forsake it, he would go to hell. "Ah, sir," instantly replied Roque, in his *patois*—"ah, sir, if you believed that there is a hell, you would not persecute me as you do!" And a little later, when urged to embrace Roman Catholicism as the better religion, "What! How can I believe your religion to be good, when I see you every day dipping your hands in the blood of Christians?" The learned and eloquent judge Anne du Bourg, whose last words before his execution, in 1559, almost two full centuries earlier, are said to have made more converts than a hundred ministers could have done—Anne du Bourg himself, the most illustrious victim ever immolated on the funeral pyre in France, could not have expressed the argument against a persecuting church more tersely and forcibly than did this illiterate peasant of Languedoc.

Nor were the Huguenot women a whit behind the men in courage and endurance. Of this fact the sombre *Tour de Constance*, at Aigues-Mortes, where so many were imprisoned ten, twenty, thirty, or more years, still stands an unimpeachable witness. No more forbidding and hopeless spot could have been selected.

About a score of miles from Nismes towards the south lies a tract of flat ground, broken up here and there only by pools and marshes, and sluggish streams, and canals. Another such desolate region, another such pestilential neighborhood, it would be hard to find. The only inhabited place above the size of a hamlet is the town of Aigues-Mortes, the dwellers in which depend for a livelihood upon fishing and the making of salt on the adjacent morasses. The place stands on the western verge of the delta of alluvial soil brought down by the Rhône and its tributary, the Saône, from the rocky sides of the Alps and the vine-clad hills of the Côte-d'Or; but the Rhône, having long since capriciously turned its streams into other channels, now seeks the Mediterranean much to the east.

Aigues-Mortes, that is, *Aquæ Mortuæ* or *Eaux-Mortes*, is the appropriate name of a place from which the waters have dried up and disappeared, save as they still linger in stagnant pools and channels, and where the very life flow of the human community has undergone a general paralysis. Yet Aigues-Mortes has a history stretching far back into the past, and is even now a strikingly picturesque spot. On the seashore, some three miles distant, lay the fleet of Louis IX., or St. Louis, when, in the year 1248, he undertook to fulfil the vow he had made in his illness, to lead another crusade for the recovery of the Holy Land; and it was right at the foot of the still existing walls that he entered the small bark which carried him through the narrow channel, now neglected and almost choked with rubbish, to take his place upon his principal ship.

The massive walls, to which I have alluded, a great rectangle with some fifteen towers of different shapes and sizes—some square and some round—were built or completed by Philip the Bold, son of Louis IX.; but that great circular work which graces one of the angles, dwarfing all the rest by the

comparison, and which bears the strangely significant name of the *Tour de Constance*, is said by some to have been reared by Louis IX. himself. Two great round chambers, the one placed over the other, form the interior. The upper one was, during the greater part of the last century, the dungeon to which the Huguenot women were consigned—the most gloomy, the most hopeless of prisons. But little light enters the place. A few narrow slits in the walls, made to serve as embrasures, and above, a circular aperture in the high vaulted roof—these alone give a glimpse of the outside world, but admit an abundance of wind and of rain or snow in the inclement part of the year. In the centre of the dungeon a well-hole, directly under the aperture in the roof, communicates with the lower chamber, the ordinary station of the guards.

I have a list of heroic women here imprisoned, immured within these walls eighteen feet in thickness. It is due to the labors of the late M. Charles Sagnier (whose premature death, on the 15th of June last, is one of the very many and grave losses which our sister society of Paris has this year been called upon to mourn). Though far from complete, it reaches from 1706 to December 28th, 1768, when the last Huguenot woman was released, and comprises it may be eighty or one hundred names. The total number of prisoners from first to last may have been twice or thrice as great. Another official list, dated 1741, gives me the names of the thirty-two women confined in the *Tour de Constance* at that time. And would you know the reasons of their imprisonment? Here are some of them as officially noted down: "for religion's sake," "for having come from Geneva," "for having been present at an assembly" (*i.e.*, of Protestant worship)—this many times—"sister of a minister executed at Montpellier," "for relations contrary to the good of religion," "for having been married by a minister," because "the preacher was arrested in her house." One of these women, a captive for merely having been present at a religious meeting, is put down as a matron of eighty years of age, and she has been already languishing two years in this damp and inclement place. But others have been here much longer—eighteen, twenty, twenty-two years—and God alone knows how many years they are yet

to stay. When, in January, 1767, the Chevalier de Boufflers visits the place, he finds, it is true, but fourteen women remaining, but the youngest of them, he affirms, is fifty years of age, she was but eight years old when she entered, and there she still remains! It may be Marie Durand to whom the Chevalier refers, and his statement is virtually correct, though the more accurate investigator may show that he has understated her age at her admission,—she appears to have been fourteen or fifteen instead of eight,—but he does not state that poor Marie Durand's imprisonment of thirty-eight years was due solely to the fact that she was the sister of a Huguenot preacher, Pierre Durand, who away back, in 1730, was captured and executed at Montpellier! Of this Marie Durand, it so happens that we have a simple but touching reminder in the Tour de Constance itself. Around the shaft or opening which communicates with the lower room, a sort of curb is found, and on it a few letters can still be descried—rough scratches made as with a pointed instrument. It was Marie Durand who is said to have made them with her knitting-needle, thus giving employment to a few moments of time somewhere in that long interval in which she was passing from a mere child to a gray-haired old woman. You can put the letters together. They form but one word, and the spelling defies the canons of the learned compilers of the "Dictionnaire de l'Académie"—R.E.C.I.S.T.E.Z. There you have it—"*Résistez!*"—"Resist!" "Endure!" "Hold your ground!" The poor prisoner of the Tour de Constance summed up in a single, ill-spelt word the history of her beloved church of the Désert during the slowly passing years, while her youthful locks were gradually blanching with years. The word might have served for the motto of the one hundred and two years of the official suppression of Protestantism. The Huguenot women in the Tour de Constance *resisted*, and lo! the creaking door, over which Boufflers suggested that there should have been inscribed the words "*Lasciate ogni speranza o voi ch'entrate*," opens to release the last of the many who have shed tears of anguish behind its bars. The Huguenots in many a town, village and hamlet resist; they continue to hold their secret meetings, to preach, to celebrate marriages, to

baptize their children in the Désert; they suffer every form of malice and manfully endure; they do not cease to try to move the government to a more humane course; they do not intermit their demands for the reversal of a legislation that denies them the common rights of man; but meanwhile they continue to organize their churches, to raise up and educate new ministers, to conquer new territory, or, rather, to reconquer for Protestantism the territory it once possessed as its own, to add synod to synod, church to church, until a great part of France is dotted with places of worship. They resist, they endure; and at length, in 1787, comes the joyful news that they are once more tolerated, and the confident and well-grounded hope that this toleration shall develop into a full and glorious liberty.

It was, under God, the resistance, the endurance of the Huguenots of the "Désert" that effected this great consummation. I would not deny the credit that may be due to foreign intercession in their behalf. I would not overlook the part which the growing intellectual movement of the age may have played. Nor could I gainsay the assertion that the interest taken by Voltaire in the cases of Jean Calas and of Paul Sirven conduced powerfully to the end. But, after all, it was the sturdy endurance of a truly religious race, that believed in a God who is concerned in the affairs of men and of nations, a race that never wavered in the conviction that that God will in due time confound exultant Injustice and give the victory to oppressed Innocence—I say, it was the sturdy endurance of the Huguenots of the Désert which enabled them to furnish to the world another signal illustration of the truth, that the battle for the Right is never lost.

THE CAREER AND TIMES OF NICHOLAS BAYARD.

THE SON OF AN EXILED HUGUENOT.*

By Mrs. Martha J. Lamb.

At the present moment public interest seems to have centered about the scenes and characters and events of just a century ago. Not only in New York but throughout the entire land the subject most talked and thought about is the approaching centennial of the inauguration of our first President. But for this evening we will step backward *two* centuries, bearing in mind that from 1689 to 1789 the march of human affairs was none the less rapid and important than in our own century from 1789 to 1889.

England in 1689 was in a peculiar struggle for the proper adjustment of the rival claims of Church and State. The revival of letters and the Protestant Reformation had given an impulse to activities of every kind. The tendency toward a democratic condition of affairs was irresistible. The mass of the people (as was believed) were to be lifted into higher political privileges, the manner of which, however, was in their minds very dimly and unsatisfactorily defined. Opposing forces grew hostile. The intelligence of the realm was so divided on the questions at issue that neither party could interpret correctly the meaning and the direction of the great movements of that period, which were to reflect themselves so powerfully upon the future of the principal nations of the world.

How the English revolution in which William III. bore so conspicuous a part concerned the revolution in which Washington was the hero, will ever prove a source of useful and fruitful study. The two greatest events in the history of the world (judging them by their consequences) occurred just one

* Read before the Huguenot Society, December 20th, 1888.

century apart. In February, 1689, all eyes were turned upon an imposing ceremony at Whitehall. A prince of Holland birth, who had been cradled and bred in a country where freedom was the battle-cry, and who possessed the ambition of a great ecclesiastical reformer, was the central figure of the occasion. The Lords and Commons of England had assembled in the spacious banqueting house to consign the destinies of the English nation to a Dutch ruler. The scene was one of the most unique and brilliant ever witnessed. William and Mary entered by the northern door, side by side, and gracefully advancing took their places under the canopy of state. William, a slender, feeble-looking man of less than forty years of age, with a lofty and ample forehead, a nose curved like the beak of an eagle, a keen bright eye, and a pale, thin, somber face; Mary, a fair, animated, happy-looking (despite the fact that she was about to take the scepter of her unhappy father), and gorgeously attired young woman of twenty-seven. Both houses approached them, bowing low. Lord Halifax spoke for the Convention, which he said had agreed to a resolution, and he prayed their Highnesses to hear it. William and Mary signified assent. The clerk of the House of Lords then proceeded to read the Declaration of Rights in a loud voice. When this was concluded, Lord Halifax, in the name of all the estates of the realm, requested the Prince and Princess to accept the crown. William responded in his own name and in that of his wife, saying, "We thankfully accept what you have offered us," and he then went on to make a short address in his own behalf, which was very well received.

At the conclusion of these stately ceremonies, the Lords and Commons retired from the banqueting house and marched in dignified procession to the great gate of Whitehall. The entire space as far as Charing Cross was one sea of heads. William and Mary were proclaimed King and Queen of England—and a shout went up from the immense crowd, that was echoed again and again until it ended in a mighty roar.

William was welcomed as the natural head of the Protestant party, the champion of the English constitution in Church and State against the efforts of James II. to change the reli-

gion of his kingdom. Two joint sovereigns was something new and novel to the English people. William was a born statesman and possessed many of the qualities of a great ruler. He was fond of authority, and could praise and reprimand, reward and punish, with the stern tranquillity of an Indian chieftain. He understood Latin, Italian and Spanish, and spoke and wrote French, English and German fluently, although inelegantly. He was versed in diplomacy, understood the condition of every court in Europe, and was interested in all questions of international usage, of finance, and of war. Mary was the daughter of James, which, notwithstanding all the prejudices against that misguided monarch, invested her with a peculiar charm; and those who knew her temper and principles rejoiced in her accession to the throne.

The effect of the coronation of William and Mary upon the affairs of the American colonies was like the shock of an earthquake. The popular idea of a democratic government was very much mixed with impossible projects and expectations. We must continually remember that this was two centuries ago, and experiment, experience and progress were yet in the future. The change of rulers in England produced a revolution, nowhere felt more severely than on this side of the Atlantic, and the conflagration then kindled was never extinguished, but burned variably for a century, sometimes wholly below the surface, then shooting forth its bits of angry flame, and finally culminating in a grand outbreak, which severed the cord, and cleared the field for the founding of a great nation. The accession of these two sovereigns to the British throne was the keynote to a hundred years of agitation, turmoil and war; its grand result—the inauguration of Washington as the first President of the United States—was the harbinger of peace and prosperity for millions of the human race.

We need not go backward very far to observe that the persecution of the Huguenots in France was the root and branch, so to speak, of the convulsion in Europe which placed William III. on the English throne in 1689. Therefore, apart from the tide of Huguenot emigration, and the influence of Huguenot culture and character upon our infant institutions during the

formative period in American affairs, the very miseries of our noble ancestors produced a series of benefits of such magnitude to subsequent generations, that the genius of statesmen, philosophers and acute thinkers will be more or less employed to the end of time in its analysis.

When Charles II. died in 1685, and James II. came into supreme power, a royal promise was made to protect the Established Church. At this crisis the whole world was in a religious ferment. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes, in the autumn of that year, as you all know, caused a simultaneous outcry of grief and rage throughout the length and breadth of Protestant Europe. The courts of Spain and Rome, not usually backward about applauding a vigorous war upon heresy, were amazed at the injustice of the French king, and valiantly took the side of religious liberty. England was dismayed, and began to scrutinize every act of James II. Some thought he was in league with Louis; others knew that he had borrowed money of his French neighbor, and brooded over *what might come of it* in dignified silence. James himself was really distressed at the outrages Louis was visiting upon the Huguenots, and publicly in an explicably pompous manner expressed his disapproval. We have all learned by heart the sad story, how men and women of all classes were victims of the most brutal persecution ever recorded on the pages of history. Not less than 500,000, escaping from France, took refuge in other countries; the best blood of France was on the wing. Persons of great fame in war, in letters, in science, in the arts, dressed like peasants, wandered from place to place, and engaged themselves in menial occupations while devising methods for crossing the frontiers. A large number reached England, and were hospitably cared for by the English people. James, not wishing to have it appear that Catholics were intolerant, put his hand into his own pocket for the benefit of the suffering exiles. Yet he groaned in spirit over the unwelcome circumstances, for he was just about to ask his Protestant Parliament the fullest toleration for Roman Catholics in England. He grew haughty, irritable, gave more publicity to his Catholic devotions, and, in short, inspired his Protestant subjects with

a general suspicion of his sincerity and integrity, and finally crowned his political blunders by the establishment of a large military force officered chiefly by Catholics.

If England believed that treachery was in the air, and that her own king through his relations with Louis might at any moment turn the deadly weapons of warfare upon such of his people as held different religious opinions from his own, how much more so this remote country, with its meagre advices from the Old World. It is a curious circumstance that at that very moment the mayor of the City of New York was a Huguenot. Nicholas Bayard was born in Holland, but he was the son of a Huguenot exile. His grandfather was the eminent Huguenot professor in the Protestant university of Paris, Rev. Balthazer Bayard, who driven from France, through the policy of Cardinal Richelieu, went to Holland, taking with him his son and daughter, Samuel and Judith, where he resided until his death. Judith became the wife of New York's famous governor, Peter Stuyvesant; and Samuel married the governor's sister, Anna Stuyvesant, and died a few years later leaving three infant sons. When Governor Stuyvesant came to New York in 1647 to enter upon the duties of his government, his widowed sister, Mrs. Bayard, with her three little boys, crossed the Atlantic with him. She came prepared to dwell permanently in this new country, and to rear and educate her children here, importing a tutor for their instruction. This tutor proved (like many another tutor before and since his time) a failure, and was dismissed. But Mrs. Bayard, having been thoroughly educated herself, was quite equal to the training of her own sons. She spoke French, English and Dutch with fluency, and was accomplished in almost every branch of practical learning. She was a tall, commanding and somewhat imperious woman, with boundless energy, and great tact and capacity for business. So well did she teach her sons that Nicholas when a mere youth of twenty, in 1664, was appointed clerk of the common council under the English Governor Nicolls—an office in which the records were to be kept in both Dutch and English—and he performed his duties with such precision that he received flattering compliments from his

august superiors. He was industrious and intelligent in the details of finance and city government. He wrote rapidly, and his penmanship was the pride of the board. He had all the flexibility of a Frenchman and the self-possession of a veteran, without the forwardness common to youth. "He is never in the way, nor ever out of the way," said Mayor Willett, a trait which may possibly account for his extraordinary career in after life. He was, however, it is said, excessively frivolous in some of his personal tastes, and when off duty devoted himself to dancing, horse-racing and other amusements of similar character, which his worthy friends considered very *wicked*. As this was the primitive period, when the most rigid rules for conduct prevailed—when, as we are sometimes told, no one in Massachusetts was permitted to make *beer* on Saturday lest it should "*work*" on Sunday—we can afford to be tolerably gentle in our judgments of the boyish proclivities of a youth of twenty, at least from our present standpoint of experience.

He was married when twenty-two, in the month of May, 1666. The circumstances connected with this important event in his history were tinged with romance. The bride was the beautiful Judith Verlet, who came to America with her brother Nicholas, an Amsterdam merchant, and resided in Hartford. The good Connecticut people found the young lady very bewitching—that is, they thought she was a veritable *witch*—and actually imprisoned her on an accusation of *witchery*. Through the interposition of Governor Stuyvesant she was released and her life saved. Her brother, the Holland merchant, had already married the governor's sister, Mrs. Bayard—whose son very soon fell in love with the much injured and persecuted maiden.

Two years later Nicholas Bayard, who had developed a remarkable talent for mathematics, was appointed surveyor of the province. He was noted for his ready wit as well as for his varied attainments, and was of great assistance to Governor Lovelace, whom he usually accompanied when compelled to make personal investigations into the boundaries of farms and manors. It was a time when conflicting land claims stirred up quarrels

in every part of the province. Lovelace had no sooner quelled one than another broke out. The difficulties of the situation were greatly aggravated by the absence of any uniform nationality. Some of the habits and customs were Dutch, some French, some English, some Christian, some heathen. The lower classes were uneducated, intemperate, unruly and sometimes shockingly profane, and the more respectable and religious inhabitants were constantly entering complaints against them. Extremes of evil and good were singularly linked together, and the barbarous punishments which English usage warranted seemed the only safeguard against anarchy. The value of a perfect understanding of the different languages spoken could not be over-estimated, and the young surveyor became a special favorite among the English officers of the government.

When New York was captured by the Dutch in 1673, the two admirals, Evertsen and Binckes, were obliged to assume the responsibility of governing their conquest until directions should come from the Hague. They wisely called into counsel a few of the most prominent citizens, and advised with them as to the proper persons for official trusts. It is an interesting fact in connection with our theme, that Nicholas Bayard was made the register of their proceedings, and was finally appointed secretary of the province, and proved most efficient in all business matters. In 1683, with Governor Dongan's advent, Nicholas Bayard was chosen an alderman for the South Ward, and was one of the first to propose the adoption of various by-laws for the better government of the city. Among these was one which reads—"No youths, maydes, or other persons may meet together on the Lord's day for sporte or play, under penalty of a fine of one shilling." Another was to the effect that no public houses should be allowed to keep open doors or give entertainment on the Sabbath, except to strangers, under a fine of ten shillings. No manner of work was to be done on the Lord's day, under the same penalty, and double for each repetition. No children were allowed to play in the streets on the Sabbath day; and not more than four Indian or Negro slaves might assemble together in any place

under a penalty of six shillings to their owners. These, and many more by-laws of a similar nature, may be found at any time by the curious in the record books at the City Hall.

Bayard was appointed to the council of Governor Dongan, and, as before remarked, was the mayor of the city in that eventful year, 1685. He drafted in connection with Recorder James Graham the "Dongan charter," which was granted to New York the following year, and was one of the most liberal ever bestowed upon a colonial city. Sources of immediate income thus became vested in the corporation. It is the more remarkable from the fact that, at the very moment of its creation, James II. was waging war against all chartered rights and privileges throughout the British dominions. The instrument was the basis of a plan of government for a great city. It was cautiously worded, and shows that the minds in which it originated were possessed of a broad and enlightened sense of the sanctity of corporate and private rights, and by no means disposed to neglect provident guards for their security. It conveyed, specifically, to the corporation the City Hall, the two market houses, the bridge into the dock, the great dock and wharf connected therewith, the new burial ground, the ferry, and the waste, vacant, unpatented lands on Manhattan Island reaching to low-water mark; together with the rivers, rivulets, coves, creeks, ponds, waters and water-courses, not before mentioned. James was not particularly partial to New York at that crisis, and in no humor to do a clever thing for any of his colonies. Thus we may presume that the charter was obtained through the tact, spirit and far-sighted intelligence of its projectors—the mayor and his colleagues, aided by the infinite good-will and influence of the governor.

The wheel of destiny took a sudden turn the following year, and Governor Dongan was himself displaced. James II. decided to annex New York to New England—to consolidate all his American possessions north of the fortieth degree of latitude in one great political whole, to be called New England. Pennsylvania alone was excepted in this grand union, as James could not afford to offend William Penn by the withdrawal of his charter. As for Dongan, he had proved himself a good

officer, and had executed his trusts faithfully and satisfactorily. His policy and independence of character had preserved northern New York to the English in spite of the French king and his shrewd manœuvres. Sir Edmund Andros received the appointment in his place, nevertheless, and Dongan retired to his country-seat. The counselors sworn into the new administration included Nicholas Bayard; and they now found their official importance very much increased, as they could vote on the affairs of Boston as well as New York. Governor Andros made Boston his headquarters, and Lieutenant-Governor Nicholson was left in charge of the affairs of New York.

The condition of the public mind in the colonies at this juncture was very similar to what it was in Europe—except that it was too far away to keep actually abreast with the tide. Protestantism was on the defense. There was much rejoicing at the change of governors, as Sir Edmund Andros was of the Church of England, while Dongan had worshiped every Sabbath with a few Roman Catholics in a small chamber in Fort James. The fact that Dongan had been directed by James to encourage the exiled Huguenots to settle in New York was regarded with suspicion. It was beginning to be known that James had apologized to Louis for his discourtesy in favoring the Huguenots, that he had admonished the Huguenot ministers to speak kindly and reverentially of their kingly persecutor in their pulpit discourses, and when remonstrated with for this imprudence, he said: "One king should always stand by another king."

Alas! that was just what the people feared.

Even the cardinals at Rome were dismayed, and said: "We must excommunicate James, or he will destroy the little of Catholicity that remains in England." A few days after he issued the commission to Andros, he published his second declaration of the liberty of conscience, in which he renewed the abrogation of all test oaths and laws against dissenters. The act was unconstitutional, and every Catholic of good judgment, from the Pope downward, was alarmed for the cause it was intended to advance. As a last plunge preparatory to the tumble from his throne, the blind king resolved to have

his declaration of the liberty of conscience read in every church in the realm. When the Sunday fixed for the reading came, only about two hundred out of ten thousand clergymen complied with the requisition. The several bishops who had led in this refusal to obey the king's command, were, against all advice, committed to the Tower. The excitement that this act aroused was without a parallel in the English history of that century, and precipitated the events which resulted in the flight of James, and the coronation of William and Mary.

There were no deep-sea cables then, and news crossed the Atlantic irregularly. It was several months before it became known in New York that England was under the rulership of a Protestant king. And in the same breath, as it were, the alarm was sounded that the King of France was preparing to assist in restoring the scepter to the fallen monarch. Knowing what the King of France was capable of doing (to further his own ends), the rumor caused universal dismay.

Boston was swift to adopt measures of a revolutionary character. It was "buzzed" from one to another that Andros was in league with the French; that he was going to oppose the lawful commands of the new sovereigns; that he had hired the New York Mohawks to destroy Boston; that he had poisoned the soldiers in Maine; with a great many other equally absurd and inconsistent things, which found credence in the excited condition of the public mind. Without a note of warning, Andros was arrested, with all the members of his council, and lodged in prison; a "council of safety" was chosen to manage affairs, the old magistrates were reinstated in office, and perfect order prevailed.

The idea of insurrection traveled with celerity: Plymouth adopted her old style of government, Rhode Island did the same, and Connecticut brought her famous charter from the oak tree and reconstructed herself.

William III. had no idea of disuniting his royal dominion of New England, but the work was done past all recall. Dutch New York rejoiced in the fact, having writhed under political connection with the Eastern colonies; and being intolerant of both popery and Puritanism, was ready to plunge headlong

into intense devotion to a Dutch prince, who was so suddenly transformed into an English king.

But there had been no complaint or suggestion of misrule in New York. The lieutenant-governor was a straightforward English official, obeying orders to the letter. He was also a devout and consistent Episcopalian, and never omitted Sabbath worship. But all at once he was accused of intrigue, and of being secretly at work in the interests of Catholic James. It was said that he knelt to say mass in the king's tent at Hounslow Heath three years before. The story was told again and again, and men's faces paled while they listened. His three counselors, Frederick Philipse, Stephanus Van Cortlandt and Nicholas Bayard, were all members of the Dutch Reformed Church; and Van Cortlandt and Bayard were deacons, in good and regular standing. Van Cortlandt had succeeded Bayard, and was mayor of the city. Just at this critical moment a whisper was started that he was in secret a Catholic, which was the immediate occasion of a widespread terror, confined, however, to the lower and more illiterate classes. Nicholas Bayard, besides occupying the distinguished position of counselor to the governor, was commander-in-chief of the New York militia. He had many warm personal friends among his equals, socially and politically, for he was bright, magnetic, genial and witty; but he was also conspicuously imperious and quick-tempered, and was both feared and disliked by his inferiors.

Presently grievances began to multiply. It was rumored that Staten Island was full of roaming papists. Every day developed some new cause of alarm. It was reported, and believed, that Dongan was the instigator of an infernal plot to destroy New York. Nicholson, it was declared, had been seen to cross the bay in a small boat, to hold "cabals" with the enemy. Another story that swelled into marvelous proportions was that King James was soon to land on the Jersey beach with an army of French soldiers. One evening some persons appeared before Colonel Bayard with a petition (unsigned) asking that the Roman Catholics in the city be disarmed. Their conduct indicated serious disquietude. Bayard tried to reassure them, for there were ridiculously few Catholics either

in city or province, and the next morning the subject was earnestly discussed in the council. The mayor sent for the authors of the petition to come and sign their names, but they were captious and ungracious. He even went to them and promised that their wishes should be respected. But the tide was rising. The merest trifles were magnified into something momentous. The common people were seemingly persuaded that the rich men, all at least who were in power, were going over to popery; and then some one heaped fuel on the fire by starting the story that Nicholson was planning to massacre all the Dutch inhabitants who should attend church in the fort on the following Sabbath. Contradiction had no other effect than to make the flame brighter.

Jacob Leisler, one of the captains under Bayard, was the hero of the hour. He had wrought himself into a frenzy of political foresight, and loudly denounced popery and kings. He lectured the people who thronged about him, and enlarged upon the uniform misrule by which King James had brought matters to this crisis. He proclaimed his loyalty to the new Dutch sovereigns, and assured his hearers that they would be sure to favor the Dutch of New York by permitting them to govern themselves. Down with aristocracy, down with tyranny and oppression! Let the people henceforth dictate. The notion that a dawning millennium was at hand, when the popular element would shoot miraculously to the top round of the governing ladder, and aristocracy come to earth and henceforth wield the plow and hammer, was seized with avidity. Leisler warned his hearers against the "dogs and traitors"—that was a favorite expression—pictured the danger that threatened the city as imminent, said Nicholson had accomplices about him, and that there was no question but that the next Sunday would be a veritable St. Bartholomew's Day.

Disorders increased hourly, and it availed nothing when Bayard and the other counselors tried to stem the torrent of the revolution, and show the falsity of the stories about Nicholson. "He is honest and trustworthy," said Bayard to his captains, when they asked him to take supreme command in opposition to Nicholson. "A little patience," he said, "and

orders will come from England to establish everything upon a proper basis." But there was *no patience*, and the confusion reached an absolute panic by the startling announcement that four or five French ships were at that moment coming into the bay. It was soon discovered that there was but *one* vessel approaching, and that it was only an inoffensive merchantman from Barbadoes. The town, however, was in an uproar and terror, and the dread of no one knew what, rendered the scene hideous. Leisler drew the people about him, assumed command, and sent an armed force to the lieutenant-governor and demanded the keys of the fort. There seemed but one course to pursue. The military had turned against the government, and the government was powerless. Bloodshed must be avoided if possible. Nicholson was a good soldier, but he was hampered; he could only act under orders from a superior. Instructions had indeed been sent to his chief in Boston, who was in prison, which had they reached New York would have saved the province from a series of notable disasters.

Nicholson sailed for England as soon as he could arrange for a passage, and his departure gave Leisler unexpected advantage. He grew lordly in his manners and severe in his requirements. His sudden greatness, which had burst upon him like a meteor, blinded him. There was sweetness in power, which soon, however, became bitter to the taste. He never understood the principles which dictated the movement in Boston, and had little or no conception of the singular tact and address which guided her through her perils. He denounced all as "papists" who would not recognize his authority. The city was under military despotism. Some gentlemen from Hartford who came to New York with the proclamation of William and Mary, said they listened to the stories of "hellish designs" until their flesh trembled. They imbibed the popular notion that New York was full of "papists," who might at any moment rise and butcher peaceable Protestants.

These imaginary dangers influenced the multitude far more than real ones would, that they could have seen. Some very good men sustained Leisler in his course; but they criticised his indiscretions, and gave him advice which he ignored. The

three counselors, who represented the crippled government in the absence of a superior officer, remained quiet until, after many painful delays, they obtained a copy of the royal proclamation in England which confirmed all Protestant officers in their places in the colonies. Then the mayor convened the aldermen and citizens at once, and published it by reading it aloud. Thus was established, beyond question, by William III. himself, the authority of these three gentlemen who held their commissions from the crown.

Leisler was startled, and became furiously angry, calling the counselors "popishly affected, lying dogs." He saw clearly that he must either put them down, or they would put him down; and he went to work with a will. They proceeded to remove the collector, who was a Catholic, and appointed commissioners to take his place until his successor should arrive from England. Bayard was one of the commissioners, who took the customary oaths and the keys, and entered upon their duties. In less than half an hour there was an uproar. Leisler with a company of soldiers came and ordered them out of the building. Bayard remonstrated and attempted to explain his position, but he was met with the old charge, "You are all rogues, traitors and devils," and was cut at fiercely by the troops. His associate, Thomas Werham, was jerked into the street by the neckcloth, and battered and bruised until bystanders interfered to save his life, who were in turn assaulted and nearly murdered. Bayard escaped to the house of Peter Delanoy, with no further injury than the crushing of his hat. But the house was immediately surrounded and in danger of being pulled down. Bayard succeeded in making his further escape after a time. But the sensational cry was raised, and spread from one end of the town to the other, that "the rogues had sixty men ready to kill Mr. Leisler."

The next day Mrs. De Peyster, the mother of one of the captains, and Mrs. Van Brugh went to Mrs. Bayard and told her that her husband was in hourly peril of assassination, and advised that he should leave the city for a time. He received similar messages from some of the aldermen, who were amazed at the fury with which he was pursued. Assisted by his friends,

who provided horses for him some miles above what is now Yonkers, he managed to escape to Albany, attended only by two negro slaves. He was cordially received by Peter Schuyler, the mayor of Albany, and by Robert Livingston, both of whom extended to him the hospitality of their homes.

Having successfully routed the commissioners, Leisler himself appointed a collector, and proceeded to direct affairs as well as he knew how. A convention which he had summoned appointed a "committee of safety," whose first business was to make Leisler "captain of the fort." Six weeks later, this committee appointed Leisler commander-in-chief of the province. Had the authority of such a committee been resolutely questioned it would have vanished like a dissolving view. Such movements serve to illustrate the errors into which men will fall who are unaccustomed to rule. The committee gave Leisler what they did not possess, and he tightened his reins and was more despotic than ever.

Of course the mayor of the city still held his office; but when the regular time for holding the mayor's court came round, Leisler determined to put a stop to it, and sent word the night before that if the mayor undertook to hold court, "the people would haul the magistrates by the legs from the city hall, and he would not hinder them." The morning came, the threat was repeated, and as neither mayor nor aldermen cared to risk the attack of a mob, with no means of defense, the mayor's court was adjourned, with the hope that relief would soon come from England.

The next disturbance came with the election of city officers. The city charter required that the mayor and sheriff should be appointed annually by the governor and council; and there was no governor, and the council was powerless. Therefore Leisler called the Protestant freeholders together, and instituted an election. A constable was sent to the house of Van Cortlandt to obtain the seals, records, charter, etc., for the new mayor. Van Cortlandt was not at home. A committee was then sent to demand them of Mrs. Van Cortlandt, who was a sister of Peter Schuyler, the mayor of Albany. She received the committee politely, but declined to give up any-

thing that had been left in her care by her husband. A sergeant-at-arms next visited her, but when she learned his errand she coolly shut the door in his face. A search was at once made for Van Cortlandt without success.

Colonel Bayard remained in Albany through the summer, but in October, learning that his only son was dangerously ill, and wishing very much to see him, wrote to the justices of the peace in New York, asking personal protection from Leisler while visiting his family. He offered to give security in money, to almost any amount, or to answer any complaints or accusations which could be brought against him, and thereby satisfy the law. But the answer he received was, "The sword rules, and we have no power in opposition to Leisler." He then wrote a letter to two of his captains, thinking it was in the line of his duty as a commissioned colonel of the regiment over them, as well as one of the counselors of the government, a letter which was to be communicated to all the captains, ordering them "to bear good faith and allegiance" to William and Mary, to be obedient to the civil authority of the city, and to desist from aiding and abetting the illegal proceedings of Leisler and his associates.

The results were most unfortunate. The letter was shown to Captain Leisler, and he saw that he must put his foot at once upon so dangerous a foe. He knew that Bayard, despite his faults, stood high in the estimation of a large class of the well-to-do and educated inhabitants of the province. He knew that he was a man of orthodox religion, of Huguenot birth, and was an able expositor of the English law. He knew that his logic had frightened some of the captains as to the consequences of the revolt. He knew that Bayard was likely to be a continual thorn in his side. In short, he was afraid of him. He therefore called a public meeting, which he addressed with fiery vigor, telling the crowd that Nicholson had never shown his face in England; that Bayard was a traitor and a villain, and was coming upon New York with three hundred men to retake the fort for the late king, James. As for Dongan, although he was living quietly on his farm and not meddling with public affairs in any way, he was charged with holding "cabals" at

his house and other places prior to making an attempt on the fort. Captain Lodwyck denied this imputation on Dongan, and was immediately dismissed from the service, with the scathing charge of being a friend to "popery and James." Captain De Peyster, who was a man of strong practical sense, seeing the mischief that was coming by needlessly terrifying the lower classes, begged Leisler to abstain from such a course. The latter, however, was in no mood to listen to reproof, and angrily suspended him from office, appointing a more pliant captain in his stead. Leisler thus lost two of the best men among his adherents, and advisers who might have saved him from destruction.

Meanwhile Bayard had privately arrived at his own house. It was evening, but a soldier saw him and ran with the news to the fort. A dozen armed men were sent at once to arrest him, and went through his house in a rough and riotous manner, greatly adding to the distress of his already afflicted family. Not finding him there, they searched Van Cortlandt's house in the same rough and insolent manner, and threatened Van Cortlandt so seriously that he was obliged to escape through the rear of his dwelling, and fly as best he could to Connecticut for safety. Mrs. Van Cortlandt bravely maintained her ground, and was finally left in peace. The house of Dominie Selyns was searched, and sixteen of the chief families of the city were obliged to submit to a similar indignity. Never was the pursuit of a victim conducted in a more indecent manner. Last of all, Captain Stuyvesant was visited. He was an own blood cousin of Nicholas Bayard, and the two had been intimate and confidential friends from boyhood. The soldiers of Leisler invaded every room in his house, from cellar to garret, and then went through all his barns and out-buildings. They acted like men infuriated. The next day Captain Stuyvesant resigned his commission, and retired from all association with Leisler.

Bayard was not found at this time; but a little later on he was seized and dragged in the most abusive manner to the fort, there manacled with irons, and the ponderous door of the prison closed upon him for thirteen weary months.

The latest provocation, which resulted in the order that Bayard must be taken "dead or alive," was the discovery of a letter he had written to the authorities in England. Leisler had feared that communications uncomplimentary to himself might lodge in the mail-bag, and therefore employed his son to follow the post-rider on his journey to Boston. He stopped in Westchester at the house of Col. Lewis Morris, and after he left there, when about one-fourth of a mile beyond, he was arrested and the mail-bag opened. Letters from a dozen or more of the prominent citizens of New York were found within, each criticising Leisler in the bitterest and most unsparing manner. Bayard was naturally the first sufferer. William Nichols, after escaping the soldiers through various stratagems, was finally seized at the Long Island ferry-house, and cast into the dungeon with Colonel Bayard.

Robert Livingston incurred Leisler's wrath, and was pursued until he was obliged to leave the province; and with Van Cortlandt, who was his brother-in-law, was hospitably entertained by Governor Treat at Hartford.

In the meantime, the arrival of parties of exiled Huguenots, and the thrilling stories they told of the cruelties they had suffered for their religion, helped to inflame the popular mind, and intensify the popular dread of Catholic rulers. The French aggressions at the north also added their terrors.

Why William III. allowed such confusion to exist in New York, when he could so easily, by a few royal words, have established men in power to whom power properly belonged, seemed marvelous. But European affairs pressed heavily upon him, and he did not understand the proportions of the tangle which was rending New York in twain. There came a moment finally when he saw it all, and appointed a governor for his neglected colony. He looked into the addresses and petitions he had received, honorably discharged Andros and his fellow-prisoners, finding no just cause of complaint against them, and appointed the former officers of the colonial government, including Nicholas Bayard, as counselors to the new governor. The name of Leisler was not mentioned. The fleet sent with this relief was a long time on the ocean, and

the vessels separating in a storm, the lieutenant-governor arrived sometime before the governor, and sent a message to Leisler demanding the fort for the king's soldiers and their stores, which Leisler refused. The city was in a great tumult, and many exciting events occurred; there was firing and some lives lost. Leisler had not the slightest intention of disobeying the king's orders, but his judgment failed him in the emergency. As soon as Governor Sloughter reached the city and learned the state of affairs, he published his commission before a large assemblage at the City Hall, took the oath of office, as did also the counselors who were present, and although by this time it was eleven o'clock in the evening, he sent a body of troops to demand entrance to the fort. Leisler refused, but sent an officer for the "king's orders," which he supposed would be directed to himself. This was hardly noticed, and the troops were sent back the second time, ordering Leisler and such as were called his council to report themselves at the City Hall, and to release Bayard and Nichols immediately from their confinement. Leisler refused to surrender the fort in the night-time, and sent two officers to explain that it was against military rules; they were not allowed to speak at all, but were committed to the guards, and the troops were sent back the third time to demand the fort, and were the third time "contemptuously" refused. It was after midnight, and the governor directed the council to meet him early the next morning. Then the city slept.

The following morning Leisler sent a long apologetic letter to the governor, tendering the fort, but the plans were all matured before the document was received. Troops were sent ordering the men in the fort to ground their arms and march out, the governor promising pardon to all save Leisler and his council. The latter, having been found in actual rebellion, were conducted to the City Hall and committed to the guards.

The great prison door was opened and Bayard and Nichols were freed at last from their long incarceration. They were brought to the City Hall looking aged and emaciated, and hardly able to stand upon their feet. They took the oaths of

office amid warm congratulations, and a little later Leisler was conveyed to the same dungeon which they had occupied, and the chain which Bayard had worn was put upon Leisler's leg.

The following Sunday, March 22, was the first time in months that the church-going community had breathed freely. The clergymen thanked God fervently for present blessings. Dominie Selyns preached from the twenty-seventh Psalm, his text being, "I had fainted unless I had believed to see the goodness of God in the land of the living." His sermon, penned through the fullness of joy at the turn events had taken, may have been a libel upon the Christian theory of mercy to a fallen foe, but it was the outpouring of a heart which had been sorely tried, and the reasonings of a spirit which had calmly reviewed the situation. It had its effect upon public opinion, and stimulated the demand which was everywhere rending the air for the punishment of the author of the wrongs which had been visited upon the community. Not a ray of pity for the mistakes of the humiliated Leisler seemed to penetrate the cell where he sat in the most abject despondency.

The trial was not delayed. A special court was ordered, and after a session of eight days the jury found Leisler, his son-in-law Milbourne, together with six of his counselors, guilty of "treason and murder," for holding by force the king's fort against the king's governor after the publication of his commission, whereby lives had been lost. And the chief-justice pronounced the sentence of death, according to the old barbarous English law then in full force. The prisoners at once appealed to the king.

The wildest excitement prevailed. Petitions for pardon from the families of the condemned men poured in upon the governor in great numbers, and counter-petitions for no pardon from those who had been wronged and distressed were equally numerous. News was received about the same time that the savages were in actual treaty with the French at the north, and without prompt action New York might be lost. Many of the prominent men, good citizens, declared their intention of

removing from the province if those "tyrants" were allowed to exist, and Sloughter was shown how these might head a mob at any time and take vengeance into their own hands. As in the scare about the Catholics, such dangers were very much exaggerated. But Governor Sloughter was a weak man at the best, and he was under the direct influence of those who had suffered until human hate had well-nigh exhausted every other fountain of human feeling.

We are apt to fall into the habit of looking at the actors in such historic scenes very much as we would regard a group of wax figures in a national museum. But there was life and breathing reality in New York at that period, and consequences entailed which were far-reaching in their results. Leisler and Milbourne were speedily executed. The governor hesitated about signing the death-warrant, through an imperfect apprehension that he would be exceeding his own powers, since the prisoners had appealed to the king. But the pressure brought to bear upon him was very great, the chief argument being that through this act he would be enabled to manage the Mohawk sachems, who were in arms, and he was to go to Albany that week. The tradition of the wedding feast, and the signing the death-warrant under the effects of wine, which has been handed along down to us by violent partisans of that epoch, and actually gone into some of our school histories, is not to be found in any written or printed record, and cannot be true to the letter, for the death-warrant was signed on Thursday—in the forenoon—and the execution did not take place until Saturday. The action was duly approved by the house of representatives, and is entered on their minutes; also by the council as a body, and it is so registered upon the council minutes.

Other men have paid as dearly for their mistakes in all ages of the world, but Leisler and Milbourne were the only two who were ever executed in New York for a political crime. Candid jurists reviewed the proceedings and pronounced both the trial and the execution perfectly lawful; others, however, claimed that there were extenuating circumstances, that Leisler had seized authority with honest intentions,

and with faith in the horrible plots his fancy created, and to hold such questionable power he was obliged to resort to the unpardonable excesses that distinguished his brief administration.

His execution was, however, in any light in which it might be viewed, a shocking political blunder. It made him a martyr, instead of a criminal, in memory, and his death became the stock of a party, which for a long series of years, by its triumphs and defeats, kept New York in a sea of trouble.

There was an endless amount of wrangling occasioned by the fact that the revolution had disturbed every man's private affairs. Property had been confiscated or seized for taxes, and neighbors were suing each other for debts and damages, and the insubordination was such that it was almost impossible to enforce the city laws. The governor died very suddenly about two months after the execution of Leisler, which added to the uneasiness of the community, and the lieutenant-governor was unanimously declared commander-in-chief until the pleasure of the king should be known.

In October was appointed another Huguenot mayor of the city, Abraham de Peyster, who, although he had adhered to Leisler and his party in the early part of the revolution, had been involved in none of the later indiscretions; and being personally popular, and of irreproachable character, it was thought he would prove instrumental in restoring tranquillity. He was about thirty-four years of age, a handsome man, of fine presence and great polish, and of elegant manners. But he was harassed in the performance of his duties as few mayors have ever been before or since his time. The virulence with which men complained of each other indicated the wells of bitterness beneath the surface of society, and foreshadowed the coming storms in the political horizon. Two hostile factions were each trying to maintain untenable grounds, and each trying to hoodwink and overreach the other. Both were smarting from wounds that were incurable.

William was distressed with the critical condition of New York, for, aside from its internal conflicts, it was in actual danger from the armies of the French king, with whom he was at

war. He appointed Governor Fletcher, and sent him to New York with broad instructions. In order to restore the peace, he granted a general pardon to all those who had been concerned with Leisler, and all prosecutions growing out of the late disorders were prudently discharged. But the new governor stumbled into errors and extravagances and raised up against himself powerful foes. The Leisler faction soon gained strength. William's inclination to restore the estates of the leaders of the revolution to their heirs was followed by an act of Parliament in 1695 to reverse the attainder. This implied censure upon the administration and engendered and fostered civil distractions, until it seemed as if the province would be rent in sunder.

It was the era of privateering. Piracy had long been in existence. Private armed vessels roved the seas and robbed and plundered at pleasure. In time of war these free sailors were encouraged by the European governments to annoy the commerce of the enemy—many held commissions from the king of England to annoy France. Presently the ships of all nations were seized, not excepting those of Great Britain herself. At this crisis the Leislerians accused Fletcher of conspiracy with the pirates, and did not hesitate to implicate many of the most respectable citizens of New York in sharing the spoils of ocean robbery. Said one: "Money increases, high houses are built, and land is made in the water." It seemed as if this was the lever by which the dominant party were to be completely overturned.

The Earl of Bellomont was sent over to supersede Fletcher, and as it was known that he had been one of the most influential in aiding the Leislerians at the court of William III., his career in New York was notably uncomfortable. He was a genuine nobleman, had been accustomed from his youth up to see power constantly associated with pomp, and found it difficult to believe that the substance existed unless people were dazzled by the trappings. He was overflowing with democratic notions, knew how to make even the commonest man or woman feel that they were the objects of his special regard, but he lived like an East Indian prince. He had a sound

heart, honorable sympathies, and an honest desire to do justice to the oppressed. But he formed opinions too hastily, and they were apt to be colored by the first hearing of a case. He indulged in the most implacable antipathy toward Fletcher, and pronounced wholesale condemnation upon all his acts. He was as precipitate as he was sincere; evidence was an after consideration in his mind.

His ears were constantly filled with exaggerated complaints, and he believed them. Nicholas Bayard and several other of his counselors became objects of his suspicion. Trade seemed traveling on a tangent. Arabian gold and India goods were marvelously plentiful. New York was getting rich at an extraordinary rate. His counselors were many of them owners of merchant vessels, and they did not come up manfully, as he thought, to help him enforce the laws of trade. The stories grew at this juncture into proportions as overwhelming as when the St. Bartholomew's Day was predicted for New York ten years before. Bellomont was told that Nicholas Bayard had assisted Fletcher in giving protection to pirates, and charged it upon him at one of the meetings of the council. The retort was in the very nature of things inevitable. Even Fletcher later on was, after a careful examination of all the charges against him, fully acquitted by the lords of trade. But Bellomont proceeded in the heat of the moment to remove Colonel Bayard and four other of his counselors from their posts. The next morning Frederick Philipse resigned.

Colonel Bayard was so indignant that he made a voyage to England at once, and personally laid the matter before the lords of trade and the king.

Bellomont also was in a continual strife with the merchants, and then he leveled a fierce blow at the great landholders of the province by attempting to break all existing land grants; thus a terrible commotion was fomented. One of the estates under condemnation was that of Colonel Bayard, and another belonged to Trinity Church.

What might have been the results of his policy must ever remain a mystery, as he did not live to accomplish his earnest

purposes. He died before the end of three years, and his death was the source of fresh troubles; and the only wonder is that New York did not fall into a state of hopeless anarchy.

His death occurred in the early part of March, and the lieutenant-governor, John Nanfan, was in Barbadoes. The governor's council consisted then of seven members, four of whom only were in the city, not enough for the transaction of business. The absentees were Peter Schuyler, Robert Livingston and William Smith—the two first being at Albany and the Hudson not open, and Smith at St. George's manor on Long Island. Messages were sent to each by a man on horseback. It was six days before Smith reached New York, and the next morning the council met, and was quickly in a deadlock. Smith was the oldest member and claimed the chair. The other four were all the political foes of Smith, and proposed to settle the question by vote. He objected. The dispute became animated, then stormy, then violent. At a late hour the disputants separated in high temper. The next morning they met again, and came no nearer reaching results. Another question agitated them, as to whether the assembly should meet on the 2d of April, as indicated by the late governor at the time of the prorogation. Smith was an eminent jurist, had been for nine years chief-justice of the province, and inclined to the view that the assembly was actually dissolved by the governor's death.

Ten days passed in fruitless arguments. On the 21st of March, Schuyler and Livingston appeared, and at once took the ground so valiantly held by Smith. The remarkable interests at stake nerved the minority—it was now three against four—for a desperate conflict. On each side were legal acumen, wit, tact and stubborn force of character, and each had always some advantage over the other. The scheme of revenge was charged squarely upon the Leislerian party, who through the policy of Bellomont were in the majority. It was believed they intended to secure at this auspicious moment an act of the legislature to sustain their suit for damages, the estimates of which were enormous. In turn, Schuyler and Livingston

were accused of defrauding the government; and Smith was informed that the late governor esteemed him a dangerous man, and was about to "oust him from the council." Every counselor was instantly on his feet, and the eloquent vituperation and inelegant and stinging satire that echoed from wall to wall in the council chamber was unequaled in history. The clamor of the angry disputants was so loud and threatening that people in the neighborhood spread an alarm. Weaver (a new man in New York, one of those meddlesome, blundering, shallow persons, who always talk much and loudly on subjects they least understand) excelled the whole party in the elevation of his voice and the belligerent aspect of his notions. He said if De Peyster, Staats and Walters were of his mind "they would put Smith and the rest of the council who would not submit to the majority fast in irons and chains, for it was rebellion."

Extraordinary and violent debates, ending in quarrels, occupied day after day. A week rolled by, and yet no settlement. With the 2d of April the assembly convened, but owing to the turmoil in the council could only adjourn from one day to another. In view, finally, of the irreconcilable nature of the controversy, it was adjourned until June. By that time Lieutenant-Governor Nanfan had returned, and taken up the reins of government. Finding the "heats and animosities" totally unmanageable in relation to the legality or illegality of the session of the assembly, he wisely dissolved it and ordered a new election.

The excitement almost produced a civil war. Serious disturbances were confidently feared. The country in every direction was quickly canvassed by conspicuous leaders of both parties. They rode night and day, without rest or food; they swam swollen streams; they slept in the woods and under haystacks. All the ingenuity and audacity of which men are capable was brought into full play. When election day came the contest was one of the most fierce and demoralizing that ever occurred on this continent. There was illegal voting everywhere, and in many places fighting and broken heads at the polls. The election over, the returns were vehemently

disputed. After much wrangling it was conceded that the Leislerians were victorious.

The next battle was in the choice of a speaker for the assembly. Ten of the members voted for Abraham Gouverneur, and nine for William Nicolls. The two candidates were sworn adversaries. Gouverneur was the able and accomplished son of a French Huguenot, not a native of New York, and he had recently become the husband of Leisler's daughter. Nicolls was born in the province—his father was the former secretary, Matthias Nicolls—and he was one of the most astute lawyers of his day and generation. The minority in the assembly undertook to prove that Gouverneur was an alien, for which charge several of the members were sued for damages in the courts and virtually expelled from the legislative councils. On the other hand, it was claimed that Nicolls and Wessells were not properly qualified to act as members, because they were not actual residents of the counties where they were elected. High words and emphatic phrases, in other languages as well as English, resounded through the (then) new City Hall in Wall Street, and peace was not restored until Nicolls and Wessells retired in a fury of exasperation, and immediately sent written complaints to England of the injustice with which they had been treated.

The party in power proceeded with alacrity to clip the wings of its most formidable adversaries. The first blow was aimed at Robert Livingston, who for more than a quarter of a century had been the Secretary of Indian Affairs. A committee was appointed to audit the public accounts, of whom was Chief-Justice Atwood, fresh from England.

Livingston was ordered to account. In supreme wrath he contemptuously refused to appear before such a tribunal. He knew there was not a shadow of proof to sustain the accusation they had brought against him. His conduct, however, furnished an excuse for the committee to publish the fact that "he would not account" for the public money he had handled, notwithstanding it was well known that his books and vouchers were in custody of the government. A bill was recommended, and actually passed the assembly before the end of September,

for the confiscation of the whole of his immense estate, real and personal, and he was deprived of his seat in the council, and all his other offices.

Next to Livingston, Colonel Nicholas Bayard was the most persistently abused, accused and threatened of any man in the province. His power as a political leader was desperately feared. Meanwhile the city elections excelled those of the province in the disorderly manner in which they were conducted. Both parties seemed lost to all sense of honor and decency. The law was defied in voting, and several bloody skirmishes occurred among individuals. In the end came a passionate dispute about which party had really won. Thomas Noell, the new mayor, was of the aristocratic party (as it was styled). He was sworn according to custom before the governor and council, whence he repaired with the elected aldermen to Trinity Church to listen to an appropriate discourse from the rector. At the end of the services these important personages proceeded down Wall Street in solemn state to the City Hall, where the bell was ringing. Mayor Noell published his commission and took the chair. The retiring mayor, De Reimer, then arose and gracefully presented to his successor the city charter and seal.

So far all went well. But when Noell directed the clerk to proceed with the ceremony of swearing in the members-elect, there was an immediate commotion. As the names were called, several responded that they had already been sworn in by the old mayor. This was the fact, the Leislerians claiming the victory, having departed from the customary method because the retiring mayor was of their own party. Cries of "It cannot be done," and "It is not according to law," came from every part of the hall. There were crowds of citizens present, and all talked together, until the hubbub was deafening. Some declared that no one could legally be sworn in by the old mayor, while others, with equal zeal and emphasis, maintained the right by law. Not only voices but fists were raised, and the uproar became of such magnitude that Noell was alarmed and abruptly dissolved the meeting. He naturally declined to sit with aldermen, as a common council, who refused to be sworn in by

him. And as the common council was the only legal authority for scrutinizing disputed elections, the city was in danger of being without a government.

The urgency of the case was such that the mayor took upon himself the responsibility of appointing four men in each ward to inspect returns. The Leislerians whom he placed on those committees refused to serve. They said the proceeding was irregular. The remainder of the committees went on with the work, and after much trouble returned the names of all the voters in the disputed wards, with the men for whom they had severally voted. It was found that the Leislerians were beaten. The mayor then called another meeting in the City Hall to swear in the new aldermen. This was on the 11th of November. The men who would be displaced by the proceeding joined the others, and all marched along the streets together. They entered the City Hall, and took their seats side by side with angry countenances. Mayor Noell arose, and said he should use no violence to eject those who had no business in the meeting. He then ordered the clerk to proceed, and the oaths were administered amid deafening confusion and roars of voices—a Babel of tongues, indescribable. The mayor attempted the transaction of business, but all present took part with impertinent effrontery. It was impossible to go on, and he adjourned the board for two weeks. The matter went before the supreme court, and the decision was for an equal division of the aldermen and assistants between the two parties. The recorder was Abraham Gouverneur, the speaker of the assembly. Thus it will be seen that the mayor and recorder were politically opposed to each other, and the board stood equally divided.

In the meantime the good citizens of New York were so aggrieved and alarmed that a petition to the king was drafted asking for a governor, "one who understood the principles of government," and it was signed by six hundred persons.

The movement was conducted with the utmost secrecy, but the authorities heard of it, and, notwithstanding petitions had been the acknowledged right of Englishmen for ages, this particular one was called "conspiracy." Chief-Justice Atwood

went further, and declared it was "sedition and rebellion." Efforts were made to discover the authors, in vain, and no clue could be obtained of the document itself. Several persons were arrested and examined, but information was elusive. Captain Hutchins, the keeper of the coffee-house where the petition was signed, was imprisoned for not producing it, which, of course, he could not do, for it was not in his possession. The leading men who had the paper in charge consulted together, and unanimously decided that there was nothing in what they had done contrary to the plain English law. They therefore ventured to write to the governor and council and ask the release of Hutchins, frankly admitting that they held the petition, but denied any disloyalty. Colonel Nicholas Bayard's was the first of the four signatures to the letter, and before noon of the same day he was arrested for "high treason," and thrown into a cell. It became at once necessary to guard the prison with the city militia in order to prevent his rescue by enraged friends. The most active man in these arbitrary proceedings was Thomas Weaver. He charged the Englishmen of New York with trying to introduce popery and slavery into the province; he said they were a band of pirates, and Bayard was their leader. The attorney-general could find no "treason" in subjects addressing the king for relief of grievances, and saw no sufficient ground for the commitment of any of the petitioners. Whereupon he was swiftly suspended for neglect of duty. The whole trial was of a most remarkable character. Weaver was the prosecuting attorney, and insisted upon sitting with the jury; when the gentlemen of the jury differed from him materially in opinion, he threatened "to have them trounced." The foreman of the jury was the brother of one of the judges on the bench. When the case was turned over to the jury, they were absent from the room but a few moments before returning with a verdict of "guilty." Chief-Justice Atwood immediately pronounced the horrible English sentence upon traitors—then in full force—and the day of execution was fixed. Bayard had been convicted and sentenced to die for signing treasonable papers, when the papers had not been seen by the lieutenant-governor, by any member of his council,

by Weaver who filed the prosecution, by the grand jury who found the bill, nor by the petit jury who brought in the verdict of "guilty." He was to be executed for supposed written treason, which was never produced in evidence nor proved to be "treason."

On the very day that Colonel Bayard was being denounced as a traitor, William III. of England, with whose coronation this paper commenced, was finishing his brilliant and eventful career. He had reigned a few days over thirteen years. The crown devolved upon Anne, the youngest daughter of James. Two months later, Lord Cornbury arrived as the new governor of the province of New York. Colonel Bayard's case was upon every person's lips, and Cornbury gave it his first attention; Bayard was quickly released. Subsequently, the Queen by advice of her council reversed the sentence, and reinstated him in his property and honors. Atwood and Weaver suddenly absconded, and were concealed under assumed names in Virginia until they could sail for England. Nanfan was imprisoned, although no one pretended to hold him responsible for the atrocious proceeding, and was kept in close confinement a year and a half. The members of the council who had countenanced the excesses were relieved from duty, and others appointed in their stead. The former attorney-general was reinstated in his office. Steps were taken also to lift the cloud resting upon Livingston, and in a few months he was proved innocent of the charges against him, and, like Bayard, reinstated in all his former appointments and honors. The political wheel went round with a click in the good olden time, and there was a prolonged ring in the metal.

THE HISTORIC CELEBRATION OF THE VAUDOIS.

AT the meeting of the Huguenot Society of America, held at Columbia College, New York, on Thursday evening, January 17th, 1889, the President, Mr. Jay, on taking the chair said:

Ladies and Gentlemen: You are to have the pleasure of listening this evening to a paper from our learned associate, Dr. De Costa, with whose valuable contributions to Huguenot history, especially as connected with the Huguenots and the Episcopal Church, you are familiar.

Before its reading allow me to submit to you a note received since our last meeting from Monsieur H. Meille, the Vice-President of the Society of Vaudois History: and with your kind permission I will preface the reading of the letter with a brief allusion to the historic incident, to the commemoration of which the Vice-President calls our attention.

The Waldenses or Vaudois antedated the Walloons and Huguenots in the persecutions which they suffered for maintaining the purer Christianity which had come down to them from the Apostles against the errors and corruption that found their way into the Church, the loose lives of many of the clergy, and their intermeddling with affairs of state.

If of the persecution of the Vaudois in the earlier ages we know but little, we are familiar with the massacres that horrified Christendom in 1655, when under the instigation that came from Rome, the Vaudois valleys were desolated by the French troops of that dastardly and cruel bigot, Louis XIV., aided, as history tells us, by Irish soldiers who had fled before Cromwell.

The state papers of England protesting against the crime were summed up in Milton's immortal sonnet, which still stirs the living blood of Christendom like the sound of a trumpet:

> "Avenge, O Lord! thy slaughtered saints, whose bones
> Lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold;
> Even them who kept thy truth so pure of old,
> When all our fathers worshipped stocks and stones,

Forget not: in thy book record their groans
Who were Thy sheep, and in their ancient fold
Slain by the bloody Piedmontese, that rolled
Mother with infant down the rocks. Their moans
The vales redoubled to the hills, and they
To heaven. Their martyred blood and ashes sow
O'er all the Italian fields, where still doth sway
The triple tyrant; that from these may grow
A hundred fold, who, having learned thy way,
Early may fly the Babylonian woe."

The atrocities committed by the soldiery are described as "unutterable," and Dr. Gilly, the author of "Waldensian Researches," * says that the year 1655 would have seen the last of the Waldenses had not all the Protestant powers of Europe interposed, especially England, where Oliver Cromwell, under the influence of Milton, became their protector. Three years later, in 1658, the Lord Protector died, and then recommenced the abominable outrages which are so graphically described by Mr. Adam Blair in the "History of the Waldenses," † who says that their history from 1650 to the close of the century is a narrative of sanguinary struggles for existence with very few intervals of repose.

In 1686, Victor Amadeus, Duke of Savoy, instigated by the courts of France and Rome, sent an overwhelming body of troops into the valleys of Lucema, Perosa and San Martino, to compel the inhabitants to go to mass. An edict for their extermination was accompanied by conditions and negotiations which were rejected, the Waldenses stating under nine different heads the reasons why the conditions should not be accepted. The last was that long before the dukes of Savoy became princes of Piedmont in 1233, the Waldenses had professed the same religion in those parts; that they had possessed the valleys since they were first inhabited, and had their religion from father to son since the days of the Apostles. The Vau-

* By Rev. W. S. Gilly, D.D., author of "Waldensian Researches." Edinburgh. Black, 1841.

† "History of the Waldenses," by Rev. Adam Blair. Edinburgh. Adam and Charles Black, 1833.

dois took up arms and defeated both the French and the duke's armies. They were then deluded into laying down their arms and were circumvented by false promises, followed, says the history, by "awful devastation, and 10,000 were imprisoned or forced to leave the country in winter." They arrived at Geneva in small detachments, and were received with Christian sympathy and allotted by the Swiss Assembly to Zurich, Bern, Basel, Schaffhausen, and St. Gallen and other cantons—the whole number being 2,500.

Henry Arnaud, their pastor and commander, communicated to the Prince of Orange and some other nobles his design of attempting a return to the valleys. The prince approved and encouraged the scheme, and in 1689, when the prince was King of England, and a war between England and France was probable, the march was begun from the borders of Lake Geneva to their native mountains for the recovery of their rights; and that march, as Dr. Gilly remarks, "was signalized by incidents unsurpassed in the history of providential and romantic events, and was crowned with success." ("Waldenses," etc., page 30.) While they were on the brink of ruin the Duke of Savoy proclaimed war against the French and took them under his protection, settled them in their ancient lands, and King William of Orange granted a salary to the thirteen Vaudois pastors. You will listen with interest to Monsieur Meille's letter.

TORRE PELLICE, le 5, 12, 88.

The Hon. John Jay, President of the Huguenot Society of America.

TRÉS HONORÉ MONSIEUR :

L'année 1889, où nous allons entrer est une date mémorable pour les Eglises et la population toute entière de nos Vallées Vaudoises. Ce fut, en effet, en 1689, c'est à dire deux cents ans passés, que nos ancêtres, conduits par Henri Arnaud, quittèrent les rives du Léman, traversèrent la Savoie et le Dauphiné et après des fatigues, des privations et des combats soutenus avec cet héroïsme que seuls la foi en Dieu et l'amour du sol natal peuvent donner reprirent possession de leurs foyers.

Ces souvenirs de souffrance et de gloire seront célébrés dans de grandes assemblées réunies à la Balsille, à Sebaoud, à la Tours, et au moyen de mainte publication populaire. Notre désir comme

Société d'Histoire Vaudoise est de nous associer à ce mouvement de joie et de reconnaissance en publiant un *bulletin spécial* pour la rédaction duquel nous nous sommes assuré le concours de nos plumes les plus autorisées. Ce bulletin ne contiendra pas un récit complet et détaillé de la *Rentrée* car rien ne saurait égaler en simplicité et en grandeur la narration d'Arnaud, mais plutôt une série d'articles détachés faisant revivre sous nos yeux tels personnages qui jouèrent un rôle important dans ces événements ; arrêtant notre attention sur tel épisode tout particulièrement émouvant et glorieux ; et nous révélant telle production littéraire de l'époque, qui nous avait été jusqu'ici inconnue. Ce bulletin sera, en outre, orné de plusieurs vignettes et surtout d'une carte indiquant la route suivie par les Vaudois, entre Prangins et Prali, et les lieux qui marquèrent le terme de chacune de leurs étapes.

Nous avons réservé dans ce bulletin quelques pages aux communications de nos amis étrangers, dans la pensée, que si nous demandions aux présidents de sociétés sœurs de la nôtre de nous envoyer pour l'occasion quelques lignes de sympathie, où s'expriment les sentiments que leur font éprouver les événements que 1889 nous rappelle et l'affection dont ils veulent bien honorer les Vaudois d'aujour d'hui, pas un ne nous répondrait par un refus.

Nous nous adressons donc à vous, très honoré Monsieur, pour que vous vouliez bien répondre à notre appel, et cela, si possible, avant la fin de Février de l'année prochaine.

Et en vous remerciant d'avance je vous serre respectueusement la main, en me disant

Votre bien dévoué,

H. Meille, *vice-président de la Société d'Histoire Vaudoise.*

Translation of a note from Mons. H. Meille, Vice-President of the Société d'Histoire Vaudoise, to Mr. Jay, President of the Huguenot Society of America:

Torre Pellice, Italy, *December* 5, 1888.

Honored Sir :

The year 1889, on which we are about to enter, is a date memorable for the churches and the entire population of our Vaudois valleys. It was in 1689, two hundred years ago, that our ancestors, led by Henri Arnaud, left the shores of Leman, traversed Savoie and Dauphiny, and after fatigues, privations and combats, sustained with that

heroism which faith in God and love for one's native soil can alone give, retook possession of their homes.

These souvenirs of suffering and glory will be celebrated in large assemblies gathered at Balsille, Sebaoud and La Tour, and also in many a popular publication. Our desire, as the Society of Vaudois History, is to associate ourselves in this movement of joy and gratitude by publishing a special bulletin, in the preparation of which we have enlisted the collaboration of writers of the highest authority.

This bulletin will not contain a recital complete and particular of the Return, for nothing could equal in simplicity and grandeur the narrative of Arnaud ; but rather a series of separate articles recalling such characters as played an important part in those events ; fixing our attention upon such episodes as may be more particularly touching and glorious ; and revealing some literary production of the period which hitherto may have remained unknown to us.

The bulletin will also be ornamented with many vignettes, and especially with a chart showing the route followed by the Vaudois between Prangins and Prali, and the places that mark the term of each of their journeys.

We have reserved in this bulletin some pages for communications from our foreign friends, with the thought that if we ask of the presidents of sister societies to our own to send us for the occasion a few lines of sympathy, expressing the sentiments awakened by the events which 1889 recalls to us, and the affection with which they are most ready to honor the Vaudois of to-day, no one of whom we make the request will answer by a refusal.

We ask you then, honored sir, to respond to our appeal, and if possible before the end of February of the approaching year.

And thanking you in advance, I respectfully take your hand in mine, assuring you that I am

Sincerely yours,

H. MEILLE, *vice-président de la Société d'Histoire Vaudoise.*

PRESIDENT JAY'S REPLY TO M. H. MEILLE.

5 WASHINGTON PLACE,
NEW YORK CITY, *Jan.* 29, 1889.

Monsieur H. Meille, Vice-President of the Société d'Histoire Vaudoise.

DEAR SIR :

I have the honor to submit to the Huguenot Society of America

the letter you have kindly sent to us dated December 5, 1888, in reference to your proposed commemoration of the return of the Vaudois under the lead of Henri Arnaud, two hundred years ago. I have now the pleasure of transmitting to you a note of the proceedings of that body on this occasion, from which you will see how cordial and hearty is their sympathy with the Society of Vaudois History in celebrating the event so fraught with glorious historic memories.

I beg leave to add to the proceedings of the Huguenot Society on that occasion a letter from Dr. Henry M. Baird, whose reputation as an author in connection with Huguenot history is well known to you, which alludes to the close association of the Vaudois and the Huguenots in their sufferings for the same righteous cause—in defending to the death Christian truth and religious freedom.

Will you please, sir, express to your honored society the cordial interest felt by the descendants of the Huguenots in America in the maintenance of the memory and the character of the heroic Vaudois who have left to the world so noble an example.

Pray accept, sir, for yourself and your society the assurance of my profound regard.

Resolution adopted by the Huguenot Society at its meeting, January 17, 1889:

"*Resolved:* That the Huguenot Society of America have listened with interest to the letter of Monsieur Meille, Vice-President de la Société d'Histoire Vaudoise, and have pleasure in expressing their cordial sympathy with that society and other bodies of the pure Christian faith, who are about to commemorate the return to their ancient homes of the heroic Waldensian exiles under the lead of Henri Arnaud two hundred years ago."

DR. HENRY M. BAIRD'S LETTER.

To Monsieur H. Meille, Vice-President of the Société d'Histoire Vaudoise.

HONORED SIR:

The expulsion of the Vaudois from their valleys in 1686, and the expatriation of the great numbers of Huguenots that fled, in consequence of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, to Switzerland, to

Germany, to the Netherlands, to England, and to the regions now comprised in the United States of America, were the result of the operation of one and the same principle of religious intolerance.

The Vaudois, who now not only dwell in peace in their original homes amid the Italian Alps, but are extending their religious influence throughout the entire peninsula, and we, who, descended from the Huguenots of France, have come into a noble heritage of freedom in this western hemisphere, have equal occasion to magnify the name of a God who knows well how to confound the plots of the wicked and to make the most malicious persecutions become the instruments of raising to greater glory and happiness his faithful servants.

In point of fact, the Huguenots and the Vaudois are more closely associated than by the mere circumstance that they were fellow-sufferers for the same cause. They suffered directly or indirectly at the hands of the same unhappy monarch, whom his contemporaries, in their admiration of his successes, surnamed "the Great," and almost exalted to the rank of a god, but whom posterity, while not unmindful of his good qualities, has degraded from the good qualities on which he was placed, and has shown to be one of the prime causes of the subsequent disasters of his country, and of the misery that found its Nemesis in the horrors of the French Revolution.

Louis XIV. decreed the suppression of the Reformed religion in France. The rigorous legislation preceding the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and culminating in that ill-starred document, while it attempted to shut up the Protestants in France and decreed the heaviest penalties against all that should seek freedom beyond the boundaries of the kingdom, in reality drove a half a million souls into exile. Having, by means of the dragoonades, by imprisonment in the galleys, and by other harsh and bloody punishments, secured, as he thought, the suppression of evangelical truth at home, Louis turned his attention to a neighboring land, and compelled the Duke of Savoy to expel the Vaudois from their valleys.

The methods pursued were opposite ; in the one case, enforced residence ; in the other, enforced exile. The object in view was but one in both countries—the entire destruction of the same religious faith, and the completer overthrow of the same Heaven-bestowed right to make a free profession of religious convictions.

Both methods have failed signally. In both countries religious liberty has won a clear victory. The stars in their courses have fought against the presumptuous king who impiously claimed the

divine prerogative of infallibility, and usurped the inalienable privilege of the individual man to decide for himself in matters of religious belief and practice.

A little more than three years ago, the descendants of the Huguenots all over the world, and the Huguenots of America in particular, celebrated the second century of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and loudly proclaimed that the loss to France had become the gain of almost every other part of the civilized globe. And now the Huguenots of America rejoice with you in the advent of the two hundredth anniversary of "the Glorious Return" of Henri Arnaud and his devoted band of Vaudois to the valleys of Piedmont —a significant prelude to the return, within our own days, of complete religious liberty to all Italy. They associate themselves with your joy, and with your thanksgiving to Almighty God. And if unable, because of the wide expanse of land and sea that intervenes, to be with you in person, they raise their hearts to heaven, praying that the God of the fathers will also be the God of the children ; and that He, who, by wonderful providential interpositions, preserved the faithful Churches of the Alps from so many blows struck at their very existence, will make them abundantly successful in the grand work of evangelizing Italy now open before them.

Begging you to convey to the honored society which you represent my most respectful salutations, I remain, sir,

Very faithfully yours,

(Sgnd.) HENRY M. BAIRD.

UNIVERSITY OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
January 28, 1889.

NOTE.—A letter recently received from Dr. De Costa states that he was unable to have his manuscript ready for publication, and the Committee hopes to print it at a later date.

PHILIP FRENEAU, THE HUGUENOT PATRIOT POET OF THE REVOLUTION, AND HIS POETRY.*

By Edward F. de Lancey.

At intervals somewhat rare, the coasts of the Middle States of America have, from the earliest settlement of the country, been visited by winter storms of terrific violence. Beginning with a warm mist or gentle rain, gradually turning to sleet under a sharp northeast wind, which in a few hours becomes an intensely cold boreal hurricane, accompanied by falling masses of whirling snow, benumbing all living creatures, covering deep the face of nature and blocking up all avenues of travel, these storms temporarily paralyze man and all his occupations and duties.

Nearly threescore years ago, just before Christmas, one of these tempests, now known by the somewhat odd name of "blizzards," struck the seaboard of New York and New Jersey, raging with greater violence in the latter, especially in the county of Monmouth.

On the evening of the eighteenth day of December, 1832, an elderly gentleman of medium stature but marked mien, not dreaming of the approaching severity of the storm, left the house of friends in the town of Freehold, to walk to his own home in the outskirts of that historic village.

But that home, where he had dwelt in quiet retirement for many years, he never reached. Blinded and benumbed by the savage storm which overtook him, he lost his strength and his way. Sinking senseless into the snow, the circling swirls of which formed his winding sheet, and the tempest's deep roar his requiem, the spirit of Philip Freneau passed from earth.

Such was the tragic end of one of the most original and

* Read before the Huguenot Society, February 21st, 1889.

gifted poets that America up to his day, and I may say to ours, has ever produced. Born in Frankfort Street in New York, in 1752, and in that city receiving his school education, he graduated from Nassau Hall, now Princeton College, New Jersey, in 1771, at the age of nineteen, two of his classmates being the celebrated Hugh Henry Brackenridge, and James Madison, afterward the fourth President of the United States.

Collegian, law student, newspaper writer, sailor, politician, sea captain, government translator of modern languages in the State Department, newspaper owner, editor, and publisher, in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, afterward and for many years a sea captain again, and merchant, and later a retired gentleman and farmer, Philip Freneau was always a poet throughout every phase of this singularly varied career. From his boyhood to his death he was a votary of the poetic muse.

A Frenchman and a Huguenot on both sides of the house, the great quickness and brilliancy of his mind attested the former, while the firmness of his belief in his opinions proved the latter. André Fresneau (the "s" was dropped from the spelling of the name after the middle of the last century), his grandfather, one of the early Huguenots in New York, and a merchant, married Marie Morin in that city, a daughter of Pierre Morin, or Morine, as sometimes spelled, whose name appears in the records of the "Eglise du St. Esprit," in New York, as the head of one of the families of that church in 1709. And his written name can be seen in the fac-simile of the signatures of the heads of those families, in the first volume of the "Collections" of this Huguenot Society of America. This Pierre Morin was also the maternal grandfather of John Morin Scott, the noted Whig lawyer and Revolutionary general. Thus Freneau and he were both cotemporaries and first cousins. The two great-grandsons of the latter were my own intimate friends and schoolmates in my boyhood in Philadelphia, one of whom still resides in that city. André Fresneau and Marie Morin had two sons, André and Pierre. The latter was the father of the poet, who was born on the 2nd of January, 1752. The two brothers were wine merchants in New York, and successful ones. Pierre bought a large farm in Mount

Pleasant, Monmouth County, New Jersey, where much of the poet's early youth was passed; and on a portion of it which descended to him he spent his latter days. His grandparents rest in Trinity Churchyard in this city, but the later members of the family, and he himself, sleep beneath the green turf of their own burial place at Mount Pleasant.

Philip Freneau married, about 1790, Eleanor Forman, daughter of Samuel Forman, of Middletown Point, of that well-known New Jersey family; but four daughters only survived him. He left no son to bear his name. Although he belonged to the third generation of his family in America, Freneau was as thorough a Frenchman as if he had been born under the sunny skies of Provence on the banks of the blue-flowing Rhone, or had drawn his first breath amid the vine-clad hills of the Bordelais, or beneath the lofty towers of an ancient chateau of historic Normandy.

Active, brilliant, courageous, clear-headed, quick-witted, full of imagination and fancy; very polite in manner, and as ready to return a blow with the pen as with the sword, the former as sharp as the latter; he was a typical Frenchman, and as brave as he was sparkling.

There is a venerable maxim, which says, "Poetry is like claret, one enjoys it only when it is very new or when it is very old." As Freneau himself wrote: "Happy with wine we may indulge an hour," perhaps we with his verse may enjoy an hour, for the age of much of it exceeds a hundred years.

One of my relatives has still in his possession some famous wine known in the family as the "Resurrection Madeira," from the fact that an ancestor in 1776 buried a quantity of it on his estate in Westchester County, and thus preserved it from the attentions of the "Skinners," "Cowboys," "Committees," and other "Sons of the American Revolution." For the fervid patriotism of these noted heroes being as pure as their pockets and stomachs were empty, they were early marked by their superior knowledge and taste in all articles, liquid and solid, which belonged to their neighbors.

Freneau was a cotemporary of this prudent ancestor, and his poetry and the latter's wine, both of the same period, hav-

ing by reason of their inherently fine qualities reached our day, I venture to offer you some of the former, believing that its Revolutionary bouquet and flavor will be appreciated as highly now, as those of the Madeira would have been then, by the distinguished gentlemen and heroes just mentioned, had they been lucky enough to discover it.

In the old days the usual rule at feasts was, "three glasses of Madeira or port *at* dinner and three bottles of claret *after*." Sherry then was never seen on a gentleman's table. But I do not mean that we shall indulge so deeply to-night, especially as the ladies have, as yet, made no movement to leave the room; to say nothing of the fact that the distinguished gentleman who presides over us is a prominent member of the Church Temperance Society.

Philip Freneau's earliest poems first appeared in the newspapers of the day, as in fact most of his writings did, during his whole life. Not till 1786, three years after the close of the Revolution, which his war lyrics and satires on the British leaders, civil and military, had greatly aided, were they collected and published, in a single small volume of about 350 pages, by Francis Bailey, a printer of Philadelphia. This was followed, two years later, by another, but smaller, volume of "Miscellanies," in verse and prose, on general subjects, from the same press. The first-mentioned volume also included a few poems composed before the war, beginning with "The Poetical History of the Prophet Jonah," a metrical version or, as he himself termed it, "a versified paraphrase" of that subject, in four short cantos of very considerable merit, written in 1768. Two years later, in 1770, Freneau wrote "The Pyramids of Egypt," a dramatic dialogue in blank verse. The scene is Egypt, the persons—a Traveler, a Genius and Time. It contains only 135 lines, and is one of the most striking poems ever written by so young a man. The Traveler, who has visited Italy, arrives in Egypt, meets the Genius, and asks to be shown the Pyramids, saying that he thought the remnants of Rome, he had lately seen, were unrivalled. The Genius thus answers:

"Talk not of Rome! before they lopt a bush
From the seven hills, where Rome, Earth's Empress, stood,

These pyramids were old, their birthday is
Beyond tradition's reach, or history."

On seeing them, the Traveler asks how many generations, monarchies and empires,

———" had their rise and fall
While these remain, and promise to remain,
As long as yonder sun shall gild their summits,
Or moon, or stars, their wonted circles run."

The Genius replies:

" The time shall come
When these stupendous piles you deem immortal,
Worn out with age shall moulder on their bases,
And down, down, low to endless ruin verging,
O'erwhelmed by dust, be seen and known no more."

* * * * *

" 'Twas on this plain the ancient Memphis stood,
Her walls encircled these tall pyramids,—
But where is Pharaoh's palace, where the domes
Of Egypt's haughty lords?—All, all, are gone,
And like the phantom snows of a May morning
Left not a vestige to discover them!"

To the Traveler's further question, how the pyramids were built, the Genius says:

" What cannot tyrants do,
When they have subject nations to their will,
And the world's wealth, to gratify ambition?
Millions of slaves beneath their labors fainted,
Who here were doomed to toil incessantly,
And years elapsed while groaning myriads strove
To raise this mighty tomb,—and but to hide
The worthless bones of an Egyptian king."

The poem closes with Time's address to the Traveler in these striking lines:

" These piles are not immortal.
This earth, with all its balls of hills and mountains,
Shall perish by my hand. Then how can these,

These hoary-headed pyramids of Egypt,
That are but dwindled warts upon her body,
That on a little, little spot of ground
Extinguish the dull radiance of the sun,
Be proof to death and me? Traveler, return,
There's naught but God immortal—He alone
Exists secure, when Man, and Death, and Time,
(Time not immortal, but a fancied point in the vast circle of eternity)
Are swallowed up, and like the pyramids,
Leave not an atom for their monument."

Is not this true poetry? Is it not extraordinary as the work of a youth of eighteen years? But one other American poet ever wrote anything to compare with it so early in life. Bryant wrote at nineteen his "Thanatopsis," and never later did he surpass that great poem, although it contains but eighty-one lines.

Totally dissimilar as these two poets were, in almost every characteristic, physical and mental, Freneau being as warm as Bryant was cold, there was yet a singular parallelism in their literary careers. Both were educated men, both college graduates, Freneau of Princeton, Bryant of Williams; both wrote as mere youths, and wrote then as men of twice their ages might be proud to write. Both studied law and then threw it aside. Both became hot politicians and fierce political writers. Both had an irresistible desire to publish newspapers, and both became editors of their own papers, and editors of power. Both wrote vigorous, nervous, yet polished, prose. Both continued to write poetry during their whole lives. Both were eminent as translators of the ancient classics. Both made purely literary ventures, and both wrote satires, and bitter ones. Both became involved in personal conflicts. Both wrote strongly against slavery. Both were eminently worshippers, as well as poets, of nature. Both, as their lives grew apace, left the press to others and passed their latter days in quiet retirement. And both enjoyed almost the longest span of life allotted to man, Freneau dying in his eighty-first, and Bryant in his eighty-sixth year.

But here the parallel ends, for, unlike Bryant, Freneau wrote better in later life than in youth, and his range of subjects and kinds of verse were wider and more varied. Bryant possessed great application, however, while Freneau had little. In fact, the latter was too versatile for his own good.

Freneau's poetry may be considered in three classes—war lyrics and satires, poems on general subjects and descriptions of nature, and translations from the classic poets and those of Italy and France, with a few which do not strictly fall under either of these heads. They vary greatly in style and finish, some wanting much of the latter quality. Freneau was naturally impulsive, inclined to indolence and often careless; and his verse sometimes reflects his moods. He seems to have written just as the incident or event happened which formed his theme, or as the idea he expressed occurred to him. Like many men of active intellect and quick perceptions, as I have said, he lacked application. Content to write for the hour, and satisfied if the effect or object aimed at was secured, he little regarded the future of the children of his brain. Hence he has left us no great narrative poem and no epic.

His verse is wonderful for its ease, simplicity, humor, great command of language and delicacy of handling. Except Dryden and Byron no poet of America or England has shown himself a greater master of English or of rhyme. The luxuriance of his stanzas is sometimes amazing. Only to the temporary nature of the subjects of most of his verse, especially of his satires, can be ascribed the desuetude into which his poems have fallen.

In vigor, sentiment, playfulness, and humor, many of them cannot be surpassed, and their beauties of form and expression are as great now as when they were first given to the world.

But Freneau possessed other and deeper poetic gifts. We have all wondered at and admired the poems of that strange son of genius of our day, the late Edgar Allan Poe. Yet the strange power of that extraordinary man existed also in the earlier poet. His "House of Night—A Vision" prefigured the wondrous conceptions of the author of "The Raven." Though not at all alike, there is in the supernatural weirdness

of each a similarity. Freneau's dreamer, wandering at midnight in a dark wood, comes upon a noble dome. Entering and ascending, he hears "a hollow voice of loud lament" from out a vaulted chamber, which proves to be that of Death, personified in human form, stretched on his dying bed. He is attended by the castle's lord, who has just suffered a heavy affliction, and who, in obedience to the divine precept, "If thine enemy hunger feed him, if he thirst give him drink," tries to assuage his sufferings, but at the same time tells him that his end is inevitable. Death gives him certain directions, orders his own burial, and dies in the greatest agony. Everything is faithfully carried out. The vision passes away, the dreamer wakes, and the poem closes with his reflections on death and what it really is. The death of Death is thus described:

"And from within, the howls of Death I heard,
Cursing the dismal night that gave him birth,
Damning his ancient sire and mother sin,
Who at the gates of hell, accursed, brought him forth.

* * * * *

"Oft his pale breast, with cruel hands he smote,
And tearing from his limbs a winding sheet,
Roared to the black skies, while the woods around,
As wicked as himself, his words repeat.

'Thrice tow'rd the skies his meagre arms he rear'd,
Invoked all hell and thunders on his head,
Bid lightnings fly, earth yawn, and tempests roar,
And the sea wrap him in its oozy bed.

* * * * *

"And now the phantom Death
Gave his last groans in horror and despair.
'All hell demands me hence,' he said, and threw
The red lamp hissing through the midnight air."

Then follows a most vivid description of the burial. The vision ends, the dreamer awakes, and the poem closes with these reflections:

"What is this Death, ye deep-read sophists, say?
Death is no more than one unceasing change;
New forms arise while other forms decay,
Yet all is Life throughout creation's range.

* * * * *

"Hills sink to plains, and man returns to dust,
That dust supports a reptile or a flower;
Each changeful atom by some other nurs'd,
Takes some new form, to perish in an hour."

Another and a very different gift which Freneau possessed in an extraordinary degree was his power of invective. In this, some of his satires rival the "Absalom and Achitophel," and the "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers" in vigor, as well as in the torrent-like flow of the verse.

Listen to these lines upon an opponent who had attacked him in abusive rhyme, and whom, under an odd name, he has immortalized:

"Hail, great MacSwiggen! foe to honest fame,
Patron of dunces and thyself the same,
You dream of conquest,—tell me how or whence,
Act like a man, and combat me with sense.

* * * * *

"Clad in the garb of sacred sanctity,
What madness prompts thee to invent a lie?
Thou base defender of a wretched crew,
Thy tongue let loose on those you never knew.
The human spirit with the brutal joined,
The imps of *Orcus* in thy breast combined;
The genius barren, and the wicked heart,
Prepared to take each trifling scoundrel's part;
The turn'd up nose, the monkey's foolish face,
The scorn of reason, and your sire's disgrace.
Assist me, gods, to drive this dog of rhime
Back to the torments of his native clime,
Where dulness mingles with her native earth."

This is certainly equal to Dryden, yet Freneau wrote it when only twenty-three.

His war lyrics and satires are models of their kind, easy,

spirited, pungent, and as humorous in describing persons as keen in depicting their characteristics. A line, an epithet or a verse occasionally occurs, too coarse for good taste, but his sins of this kind are exceedingly few. His thorough personal knowledge of the period in which he lived, and of the men, and the politics in which he took part, gave him great advantages, of which he was by no means slow to profit.

The two famous New York printers of the Revolutionary era have never been so well described as by Freneau, severe as he was upon both. His pen portraits of James Rivington and Hugh Gaine are well-nigh perfect. The former, an Englishman by birth, who began publishing a paper in New York in 1773, Freneau wrote of as a fierce Tory; but occasionally he seems to have had a vague suspicion of what is now known to be the fact, that he was, or rather became, a spy for Washington. Certainly deception incarnate was never painted with greater force than in Freneau's characterizations of Rivington.

As to Gaine he knew him well, and was familiar with his long career in New York before, during, and after, the Revolution. A Belfast Irishman, he printed a paper in New York from 1752 to about 1786. Favoring the opposition to the British Ministry in the early stages of the dispute, but supporting them later, on the capture of New York by Sir William Howe, Gaine fled to Newark, New Jersey, but in a few months returned, resumed the publication of his paper, maintained it during the English occupation, and at its close, taking the royal arms from its heading, and removing the Crown from beside the Bible on his office sign, in Hanover Square, continued the paper, as Rivington did his, both as good Republican sheets. Nevertheless, till his death in the early part of this century he was considered a personally honest man.

In a poem in the form of "A Letter to the Whigs of New York," supposed to be written by Rivington, in December, 1783, just after the evacuation, Freneau makes him say:

> "'Twas a *chance*, a mere chance, that your arms gain'd the day,
> 'Twas a *chance* that the Britons so soon went away,
> To *chance* by their leaders the nation is cast,
> And *chance* to perdition will send them at last.

"Now because I remain when the puppies are gone,
You would willingly see me hanged, quartered, and drawn,
Though I think I have logic sufficient to prove,
That the *chance* of my stay is a proof of my love.

* * * * *

"And therefore excuse me for printing some lays,
An ode, or a sonnet, in Washington's praise.

"His prudence alone has preserved your dominions,
This bravest and boldest of all the Virginians!
And when he has gone,—I pronounce it with pain,
We scarcely shall meet with his equal again."

In the second part of this same poetical letter, occur these lines:

"If you stood my attacks I have nothing to say,
I fought like the Swiss for the sake of my pay,
But while I was proving your fabric unsound,
Our vessel miss'd stays, and we all went aground.

"Thus ended in ruin what madmen begun,
And thus was our nation disgraced and undone.

* * * * *

"You pretend I have suffered no loss in the cause,
And have therefore no right to partake of your laws.
Some people love talking—I find to my cost,
I too am a loser,—my character's lost!"

At the end of the letter he mentions a visit from the ghost of Gen. Robertson, the last British governor, who advises him to go to Nova Scotia, "which," he tells the Whigs,—

"I surely shall do if you push me too hard,
And so I remain, with eternal regard,
James Rivington, printer of late to the King,
But now a republican under your wing—
Let him stand where he is, don't push him down hill,
And he'll turn a true blue skin or just what you will."

Another short poem styled "Truth Anticipated" ends with a brief keen epitaph upon Rivington, in these witty lines:

"Here *lies* a King's Printer, we needn't say who:
There is reason to think he tells what is true:
But if he *lies* here, 'tis not overstrange,
His present position is but a small change,
So reader, pass on—'tis a folly to sigh,
For all his life long he did little but *lie*."

Gaine, Freneau treated in a little different way, perhaps induced by the fact that in his paper some of his earlier poems first saw the light. In a versified petition to the Senate of New York, in 1783, for recognition, he makes Gaine give this account of himself, and in it incidentally expresses his own idea of his own powers.

"I first was a whig with an honest intent,
Not a fellow among them talk'd louder or bolder,
With his sword by his side, or his gun on his shoulder;
Yes, I was a whig, and a whig from my heart,
But still from Britain was unwilling to part,
I knew to oppose her was foolish and vain,
I knew she would turn and embrace us again,
And make us as happy as happy could be,
By renewing the era of mild SIXTY-THREE;
And yet like a cruel undutiful son,
Who evil returns for the good to be done,
To gain a mere trifle,—a shilling or so,
I printed some treason for Philip Freneau,
Some damnable poems reflecting on Gage,
The King and his Council, and writ with such rage,
So full of invective, and loaded with spleen,
So pointedly sharp, and so hellishly keen,
That, at least in the judgment of half our wise men,
Alecto herself made the nib to his pen."

It is in this poem that there occurs an exceedingly fine image—one of the striking creations of a true poet.

In describing the general flight of inhabitants from New York, which followed the defeat of Washington at Brooklyn, and Gaine's escape on horseback to New Jersey with the rest, he says:

"To Newark I hastened, but trouble and care,
Got up on the crupper and followed me there."

In 1780, Freneau sailed from Philadelphia, in the letter of marque *Aurora*, for the West Indies, but was captured off the capes of the Delaware by the British frigate *Iris*, and sent to New York, a prisoner of war, where he was confined on board the *Scorpion* prison ship, and falling ill he was transferred to a hospital vessel. This incident and his severe treatment he has set forth in a poem in three brief, spirited cantos entitled, "The British Prison Ship." His destination is first described:

"those isles where endless summer reigns,
Fair fruits, gay blossoms, and enamelled plains,
Where sloping lawns the roving swain invite,
And the cool morn succeeds the breezy night,
Where each glad day a heaven unclouded brings,
And sky-topt mountains teem with golden springs."

The last broadside of the *Iris*' guns which effects the capture, is thus given:

"Another blast as fatal in its aim,
Wing'd by destruction, through our rigging came
And, whistling tunes from hell upon its way,
Shrouds, stays, and braces, tore at once away,
Sails, blocks, and oars, in scattered fragments fly—
Their softest language was, SUBMIT OR DIE."

The sufferings of the prisoners from the brutalities of the guards, starvation and thirst, and his resulting illness and transfer to the hospital ship, and its surgeon, are most vividly portrayed, as well as the latter's treatment, which is set forth in these biting words:

"He drench'd us well with bitter draughts, 'tis true,
Nostrums from hell, and *cortex* from Peru,—
Some with his pills he sent to Pluto's reign,
And some he blistered with his flies of Spain;
His cream of tartar walked its deadly round,
Till the lean patient at the potion frown'd,
And swore that hemlock, death, or what you will,
Were nonsense to the drugs that stuff'd his bill."

He thus describes the daily deaths and burials on the Long Island shore at the Wallabout:

> "By feeble hands the shallow graves were made,
> No stone memorials o'er the corpses laid;
> In barren sands, and far from home, they lie,
> No friend to shed a tear when passing by;
> O'er the mean tombs insulting Britons tread,
> Spurn at the sand, and curse the rebel dead."

An appeal then follows to Americans to

> "Rouse from your sleep, and crush the thievish band,
> Defeat, destroy, and sweep them from the land;"

and the poem closes with this prediction of final defeat to the British:

> "The years approach that shall to ruin bring
> Your lords, your chiefs, your miscreant of a King,
> Whose murderous acts shall stamp his name accurs'd,
> And his last triumphs more than damn his first."

The whole poem of about 700 lines was intended to rouse up American feeling, then—in 1780—excessively depressed; and the extracts that have been given will show Freneau's power to arrest public attention, as well as the variety, beauty and force of different characteristics of his verse.

Of course the poem is exaggerated in its statements, but in this the skill of the true poet shows itself, for in all appeals of this kind, exaggeration is a necessity if an effect is to be produced—just as the sculptor is obliged to make the figure of his hero larger than life, if his statue is to be impressive.

It was believed by the ancients that to poets was given the power of foretelling future events, and the earliest name by which the Romans called them was *vates*, which primarily signifies a prophet, a seer. This idea, perhaps not altogether fanciful, was, before their time, held by the Greeks in connection with their religion, for in those old days priests were poets and poets were priests.

No poet ever possessed this prophetic gift in a greater

degree than Philip Freneau. In the very dialogue he wrote for his commencement piece, in 1771, occur these lines:

—"I see, I see
Freedom's established reign ; cities and men,
Numerous as the sands upon the ocean shore,
And empires rising where the sun descends!
The Ohio soon shall glide by many a town
Of note ; and where the Mississippi's stream,
By forests shaded, now runs weeping on,
Nations shall grow, and States, not less in fame
Than Greece and Rome of old! We too shall boast
Our Scipios, Solons, Catos, sages, chiefs,
That in the womb of time yet dormant lie,
Waiting the joyous hour of life and light.
O, snatch me hence, ye muses, to those days
When through the veil of dark antiquity,
Our sons shall hear of us as things remote
That blossom'd in the morn of days—Alas!
How could I weep that we were born so soon,
Just in the dawning of these mighty times,
Whose scenes are painting for eternity."

In "The Power of Fancy," a brilliant poem, beginning

"Wakeful, vagrant, restless, thing,
Ever wandering on the wing,"

he describes in flowing verse how Fancy leads him through various famed places in Europe and Asia to an isle of the Indian seas, and then exclaims:

"Bear me from that distant strand
Over ocean, over land
To California's golden shore,—
Fancy stop, and rove no more."

This was written in 1770, seventy-eight years before the discovery of gold in the race-way of the famous mill of Colonel Sutter, in the valley of the Sacramento.

Again, in September, 1775, appeared in New York one of those "damnable poems reflecting on Gage" which have already been mentioned, in two parts. The first is an imaginary discussion of a council of war held by Gage in Boston, in which

Burgoyne, Percy, Howe and Wallace take part and decide on a plan of operations. The second is a bold protest, an appeal to Americans to resist Britain's claims, containing this fine passage:

"The time shall come when strangers rule no more,
Nor cruel mandates vex from Britain's shore,

* * * * *

"When mighty towns shall flourish free, and great,
Vast their dominion, opulent their state,
When one vast cultivated region teems
From ocean's side to Mississippi's streams,
While each enjoys his vine-tree's peaceful shade,
And even the meanest has no foe to dread."

This last poem is very remarkable for another and a very different subject. It contains a most striking and effective proof of a fact in Revolutionary history, which it is the modern fashion for writers and orators on that subject, of every degree, to conceal, ignore or slur over. That fact is, that the Revolutionary War was *not* begun to obtain independence, but *was* begun to obtain those rights of Englishmen which all Americans claimed as their birthright, and which the British government wickedly denied them.

Its closing stanza is this:

"Long may Britannia rule our hearts again,
Rule, as she ruled, in George the Second's reign;
May ages hence her growing grandeur see,
And she be glorious—but ourselves as free."

And this, be it remembered, was written six months *after* Bunker's Hill.

Perhaps the finest of Freneau's war lyrics is his ode "To the memory of the brave Americans who fell at Eutaw Springs." It consists of but eight stanzas of four lines each. For melody, spirit, fire and feeling, it has rarely, if ever, been surpassed. This is the poem of which Mr. Henry Brevoort tells us that Sir Walter Scott asked him the author's name, saying he had met it in a magazine, had it by heart, and knew it was American. On being told it was Freneau's, Scott said,

"It was as fine a thing of the kind as there was in the language." And he used a line from it in his famous apostrophe to the Duke of Brunswick, in the introduction to the third canto of Marmion.

Freneau's fifth verse is this:

"They saw their injur'd country's woe;
The flaming town, the wasted field;
They rushed to meet the insulting foe;
They took the spear, but left the shield."

Scott wrote, improving the line by using a stronger verb:

"Lamented chief, not thine the power
To save in that presumptuous hour,
When Prussia hurried to the field,
And snatched the spear, but left the shield."

One of the most delicate and tender of Freneau's poems is that entitled, "Lines on Visiting an Old Indian Burying-Ground," and describing his visions while within its ancient precincts at night:

"There, oft a restless Indian Queen
(Pale Marion with her braided hair),
And many a barbarous form, is seen
To chide the man that lingers there."

"By midnight moons, o'er moistening dews,
In vestments for the chace arrayed,
The hunter still the deer pursues,
The hunter and the deer a shade."

This last line, beautiful, and characterized by the fine sentiment of Freneau, so struck Thomas Campbell that he placed it, unchanged, in a verse of his famous poem of O'Conor's Child, thus describing her dead lover as she sees him in spirit, while watching his grave:

"He comes, and makes her glad;
Now on the grass green turf he sits,
His tasseled horn beside him laid;
Now o'er the hills in chace he flies,
The hunter and the deer a shade."

But, sorry am I to say, neither of these poets ever acknowledged their indebtedness to Philip Freneau.

Freneau's originality was very marked. He followed not in the steps of Dryden, nor any other of the poets of the Augustan age; nor like his contemporaries, Trumbull and Barlow, in those of Young and Pope. Not only did he not follow classic example, but he struck out a style of his own. Free, clear and expressive, he cast aside the trammels of the stately verse in which his predecessors and contemporaries delighted, and wrote just as he seems to have felt, and in whatever way he deemed most appropriate to his subject. Although careless in his rhymes, he was, nevertheless, always effective.

So long was his life that he wrote some of his finest poems after the advent of that brilliant galaxy of poets, who burst forth in the early part of this nineteenth century. But not a trace of Moore, Southey, Campbell, Rogers, Scott, Wordsworth or Byron, is to be found in the last two small volumes of his poems which he gave to the world in 1815.

Freneau's prose writings were of two kinds, brief essays on many subjects after the manner of the *Spectator* and the *Tatler;* and travels and reports of an imaginary character, related and made to their kings by an inhabitant of Otaheite, and a Creek Indian, after their return from civilized lands, after the example of Voltaire. To these may be added his political disquisitions and translations from French historical writers. The best of the former were written over the pen-name of "Robert Slender." All are pleasing, witty, humorous, easy and agreeable, and show great and close power of observation.

His political writings, action and opinions, are a most interesting theme, but they would require a full essay to be adequately presented. A strong Democrat, a believer in Jefferson, and like so many men of his day, carried away by the French Revolution, the ardor of his nature and the firmness of his opinions, with the vigor and terseness of his style, made him an adversary to be feared.

The quarrel between Hamilton and Jefferson, growing out of his editing a newspaper in the interest of the latter, while

holding the place of French translator under the government, in which he attacked the financial policy of the former, during Washington's first administration, and which so greatly annoyed the great President, is a matter of history. Freneau was as perfectly sincere and honest in his political opinions as he was free and outspoken in their expression. Leaving politics and the party press after a few years, he resumed his sea life about the year 1800, and became again engaged in voyages and mercantile ventures, from which facts he is often referred to as "Captain Freneau." To this period are to be ascribed some of his finest and most perfect descriptions of nature, especially of nature in the tropics. Two poems, one styled "The Beauties of Santa Cruz," and the other descriptive of the shores of Carolina and Charleston, are instinct with true poetic fire. His versified translations from the Latin show how well his college days were spent, and how late in life he kept up his classic studies. No finer rendition of the fifteenth ode of the first book of Horace, Nereus's prophecy of the destruction of Troy, than Freneau's exists; while his translation of Gray's famous "Ode written at the Grande Chartreuse," is as striking and beautiful as the original itself.

Such was the poetry of the Huguenot patriot of the Revolution. Born eight years before the death of George the Second, and living far into the presidency of the seventh ruler of the United States, General Andrew Jackson, Philip Freneau is the only poet whose ringing verse roused alike the hearts, and nerved the arms, of two generations of Americans against England. He immortalized alike the successes of the Revolution and those of the war of 1812. He sang, with equal spirit, force and fire, the glory of Trenton and the triumph of Chippewa, the conqueror of Yorktown and the victor of Niagara. He sang, too, the heroic battles of Paul Jones on the German ocean, and those of Perry and McDonough on the waves of Erie and the waters of Champlain; and also, but in sadder strains, the fate of André and the death of Ross.

HISTORY OF THE EDICT OF NANTES.*

By Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Church History in the Union Theological Seminary, New York.

Four years ago the Huguenot Society of America commemorated the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. To-day I propose to present to you a brief history of the Edict of Nantes, its original provisions, its temporary defeat and ultimate triumph.

LITERATURE.

The literature of the Edict of Nantes and its Revocation (which are usually treated together) is very extensive. I mention the following works, most of which I have consulted for this essay:—Dumont: *Corps diplomatique universel du droit des gens* (Amsterdam, 1726), V. A. 545 *sqq.* Elie Benoît: *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes* (Delft, 1693–'95, 5 vols.). De Thou (Thuanus): *Historiarum libri cxxxviii. ab anno* 1546 *ad annum* 1607, Book cxxii. (London ed., 1733). Martin: *Histoire de France*, tome x., 421–425; xiii., 599–615; xiv., 37–46 (fourth ed., Paris, 1878). L. Anguez: *Histoire des Assemblées Politiques des Réformés en France*, 1573–1622 (Paris, 1859), p. 82 *sqq.*, 188 *sqq.* G. von Polenz: *Geschichte des französischen Calvinismus*, vol. III. (Gotha, 1864), pp. 644–866. Ranke: *Französische Geschichte*, II., 39–59; III., 454–484 (third ed., Stuttgart, 1877). L. Aguesse: *Histoire de l'établissement du protestantisme en France* (Paris, 1886), tome IV., 585 *sqq.* (The text of the Edict is given in an appendix, IV., 601–620). Bordier et Charton: *Histoire de France*, II., 109 *sqq.*, 274 *sqq.* (Paris, 1878). *Bulletin historique et littéraire de la société de l'histoire du protestantisme français*, 34° *année*, Nos. 9 et 10 (Paris, 1885). Léon Pilatte: *Edits, Déclarations et Arrêts concernant la religion*

* Read before the Huguenot Society of America, March 21st, 1889.

prétendue réformée, 1662–1751 (Paris, 1885; the Edict of Nantes is given first, pp. i.–lxxxii.). HENRY M. BAIRD: *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre* (New York, 1886), II., 414 *sqq.*; and his oration at the Huguenot Society's "Commemoration of the Bi-Centenary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes," New York, 1886, p. 24 *sqq.* THEOD. SCHOTT: *Die Aufhebung des Ediktes von Nantes* (Halle, 1885). Also a number of biographical articles in the important biographical work *La France protestante par MM. Eugène et Émile Haag*, Paris, 1877, *sqq.*, 10 vols. (second ed. by H. Bordier).

HENRY IV. AND THE EDICT OF NANTES.

The ever-memorable Edict of Nantes, the ancient capital of Brittany, was issued and signed by Henry IV., April 13th, 1598, and ratified by the Parliament of Paris, February 25th, 1599. It bears the title: "*Edit du Roy sur la Pacification des Troubles de ce Royaume.*" It brought the stormy period of the French Reformation to a close.

Henry of Navarre, the descendant of Hugo Capet, the political and military leader of the Huguenots, as the Calvinists were called, and protector of their religion, ascended by hereditary right the throne of France as Henry IV., August 2nd, 1589, abjured from policy the Protestant religion, and professed the faith of the great majority of Frenchmen at St. Denis, July 25th, 1593, but secured five years later, according to repeated promise, a legal status to his former associates in arms and religion. Before that time they were a proscribed party, and depended altogether on the fortunes of war. They achieved temporary concessions by their victories, but lost them again at the renewal of hostilities, and would probably have been overpowered in the end by the vast majority of Roman Catholics, who had the active sympathy of all papal countries.

The number of Calvinistic congregations at the time of the accession of Henry IV. was over 750, with a membership of perhaps one million, or one-twentieth part of the whole population. According to a statement not sufficiently authenti-

cated, there were then 274,000 Protestant families, or 1,250,000 souls, in France.*

They were then a strong political as well as religious party, and occupied many fortified places.

The Edict of Nantes was prepared by a commission which included such men as Gaspard de Schomberg and the distinguished historian and jurist Jacques Auguste de Thou. It is a long and complicated document, containing: (1) ninety-two public articles; (2) fifty-six "secret" articles; (3) a "brevet" or patent of the king; (4) a second set of twenty-three "secret" articles, which were added on the last day of April, 1598.

The first of these four papers is the most important, and expressly declares the Edict to be "perpetual and irrevocable." † The Edict proclaims no general principle, but makes important concessions. It is a statesmanlike recognition of the rights of a highly respectable and influential minority, as far as existing circumstances seemed to demand and to permit. It is based upon previous pacification Edicts of 1563, 1570, 1577, enlarged them, and gave them permanency.

The chief provisions of the Edict are as follows:

The Huguenots were guaranteed full personal liberty in any part of France, without molestation on account of their religious opinions, and made eligible to all secular offices of trust, honor or emolument. For their special protection special tribunals, called "Chambers of the Edict," were instituted in the Parliaments. They are allowed free access to the schools, colleges and hospitals; they may establish their own schools and universities, and publish religious books in the places where their worship is allowed; portions of the public cemeteries or special cemeteries are assigned to them for the peaceful burial of their dead; they are authorized to hold consistories, colloquies, provincial and national synods.

In the "brevet" or patent, the King pledges the annual sum of 45,000 crowns from the public treasury, for the support

---

* See the note in Martin, X., 575. He reduces the number of congregations to 500, but it is usually stated at 760 or more.

† "*Edit perpétuel et irrévocable*," at the close of the introduction.

of their clergy and the expenses of the synods. The possession of their fortified cities was guaranteed to them for a term of eight years, and an annual sum of 180,000 crowns was set apart for the maintenance of the garrisons.*

But here the principle of justice and equality ceased. The public worship of the Huguenots was restricted to certain cities and places where it had been recently (in 1596 and 1597) maintained. It was forbidden in Paris and the surrounding district of five leagues, in the residences of the court and other large cities, where worship could only be held in private houses and within closed doors. Consequently the Huguenots had often to walk or ride from ten to thirty miles to hear a Protestant sermon (*prêche*). Moreover, their creed is disparaged in the Edict by the designation of the *pretended* Reformed religion.† The Roman Catholic religion remained in every respect the only religion of the State, and the Protestants were required to pay the tithe to the clergy, to respect the fasts and feasts, and to conform to the marriage laws of the Roman Church.

The Edict, therefore, falls far short of religious liberty and equality. It recognizes fully the liberty of private conscience, but restricts the liberty of public worship. It is "a compromise between natural justice and social necessity."‡ But it goes as far as practicable, and marks a great advance beyond the public opinion of that age. It deserves to be ranked "among the grandest monuments of European civilization."§ It is the first attempt to recognize two forms of worship under the common patronage of the civil government, though with a decided preference for the religion of the majority. It anticipated the present system in France, which was introduced by the first Napoleon.

The Edict created the greatest agitation and opposition in France. The Huguenots feared another massacre of St. Bar-

---

* The pecuniary promises, however, were only partially fulfilled.

† "*La religion prétendue réformée*"; and the Huguenots are styled, "*Les prétendus réformés.*"

‡ Augustin Thierry.

§ H. M. Baird, *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*, II., 420.

tholomew's Day. Processions were held and sermons preached against it. Rome, true to her instincts, denounced it in unmeasured terms. When Pope Clement VIII. was informed of its ratification, he declared to Cardinal d'Ossat, the French ambassador (as he reported to the King), that the "Edict is the most accursed that can be imagined, whereby liberty of conscience is granted to everybody, which is the worst thing in the world. In addition to this, the worship of that damnable sect is permitted throughout the kingdom; and the heretics are introduced into the courts of Parliament, and admitted to all charges, honors and dignities, so as henceforth to oppose everything that might turn to the advantage of the Catholic religion, and so as to promote and further heresy. Moreover, I see the King has made this Edict at a time when he is at peace both within and without his realm; so that it cannot be said that he has been compelled to make it." This unmeasured denunciation is quite in keeping with the glorification of the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day by Pope Gregory XIII., who responded to it by a *Te Deum* in the churches of Rome, and commemorated it by a medal representing "the slaughter of the Huguenots" by an angel of wrath.

Henry regarded the threats of the Pope as empty clouds, from which no lightning nor thunder was to be feared. He adroitly maintained a friendly political neutrality towards the two religious parties of his kingdom, till he fell by the knife of an assassin, May 14th, 1610, in the midst of his brilliant career and plans for a military campaign against Germany, and a possible reconstruction of the map of Europe. The crime of François Ravaillac has often been traced to Jesuitical inspiration in revenge for the Edict of Nantes, but the Bishop of Paris, Cardinal Gondy, solemnly attested the innocence of the Catholic Church and the order of the Jesuits. The assassin refused, even under frightful tortures, to disclose any name, but assigned as his motive that the king would not bring the Huguenots back to the Catholic Church, and that he intended to make war against the Pope, that is, against God.* He was

* "*Que dieu estoit le pape, et le pape estoit dieu.*" Ranke, *Franz. Geschichte*, II., 130.

a wild, half-crazy fanatic, who associated with the most bigoted monks and priests, and embodied the Romish indignation against the Edict of Nantes, as the assassin of President Lincoln embodied the spirit of the pro-slavery rebellion. Ravaillac was torn to pieces by four horses. Pope Paul V. saw in the tragic fate of Henry IV. a divine chastisement.*

Henry IV. is the most French and the most popular of all French kings, and combined the virtues and vices of his nation. The saying, "Paris is worth a mass," though not authentic, expresses the selfish motive of his submission to Rome, but he soothed his conscience by a patriotic motive of duty to the State, and by the substantial service he did to the Huguenots in just return for their services to him and to France. He had serious moments in which he feared that, by abjuring his faith, he had committed the sin against the Holy Spirit, as he confessed to a Protestant friend and counselor, Agrippa d'Aubigné, in a dangerous illness; and he told once to the Landgrave of Hesse that he intended before his death to declare once more his preference for the Reformed faith.† He was the pacificator of France, a just and far-sighted statesman, and died a martyr of religious liberty.‡

The Edict of Nantes was repeatedly confirmed—by Marie de Médicis, May 22nd, 1610; by Louis XIII., October 1st, 1614, and in March, 1626; by Anne d'Autriche, the widow of Louis XIII., July 8th, 1643; and by Louis XIV., May 21st, 1652—but never fully carried out, and often violated. At every national Synod complaints were made of non-payment of the promised aid.

---

* "*Deus gentium fecit hoc, quia datus erat in reprobum sensum.*" Ranke, II., 132.

† Ranke, II., 100, and Rommel's *Correspondance de Henry IV.*, p. 79, as quoted by Ranke. I have some doubts on this subject; for the last word of Henry to Agrippa d'Aubigné was: "*Je tiens ma vie temporelle et spirituelle entre les mains du pape, que je reconnais pour le véritable vicaire de Dieu.*"—*La France Protestante*, I., 485.

‡ Martin, X., 571: *Les penseurs ne cesseront jamais d'honorer en lui le précurseur d'une Europe nouvelle, l'esprit juste et profond, . . . le champion enfin et le martyr de la plus sainte des libertés, de la liberté de conscience.*"

HALF A CENTURY OF REPOSE AND PROSPERITY.

Nevertheless the Reformed Church of France flourished for half a century after the Edict, and commended herself to Christendom by a high order of intelligence, virtue and piety. Her members were among the most intelligent, industrious, conscientious and useful citizens. Her academies and theological seminaries at Montauban, Saumur, Nîmes and Sedan took a high rank in sacred and secular scholarship, and attracted foreigners, even princes of the house of Brandenburg. Her divines, controversialists and preachers, such as Daillé, Blondel, Basnage, Cappel, Amyraut, La Place, Du Moulin, Jurieu, made valuable contributions to the literature of France, and indirectly to the revival of the Roman Church, which would scarcely have produced a Bossuet, a Fénelon and a Pascal without the influence of the Reformation. John Calvin laid the foundation for classical French prose. The pulpit of Charenton on the Seine, a few miles above Paris, had a succession of eloquent preachers, as Daillé, Drelincourt, Allis, Mestrezat, Claude. While the Roman Church was agitated by the Jansenist controversy, the Calvinists of the schools of Montauban, Saumur and Sedan discussed the subtle questions of inspiration, predestination and imputation, and ably conducted the argument against the Romanists. They maintained strict discipline in their churches, and held provincial and national synods; for the last time in Loudun (Anjou), in 1659, under the moderatorship of Daillé, when an order from Louis XIV. prohibited such synods in future, on the frivolous pretext that they were too expensive and too troublesome.

Nor were the Huguenots at all behind their Catholic neighbors in secular pursuits, but rather excelled them. They developed the agriculture, commerce and manufactures of the country. They furnished eminent men to all the learned professions, to the army and to the navy. The true founder of the French Academy and its first secretary was a firm Protestant, Valentin Conrart, whom Richelieu kept in office till his death.* It is asserted that the finest victories of French arms

* *La France Protestante*, IV., 575 *sq.*

under Louis XIII. and XIV. were due to captains of the Huguenot faith, as the Count de Gassion, Marshal Guebriant, Marshal Rantzan, the Duke de la Force, the Duke de Rohan, Marshal du Chatillon, Admiral Du Quesne, Schomberg, Marshal Turenne (whose mother was a daughter of Prince William of Orange); though some of them, like Turenne in his old age, made their submission to the Catholic Church, together with most of the nobility during the reign of Louis XIV.*

Cardinal Richelieu, the great prime minister of Louis XIII., destroyed the power of the Huguenots as a political party by the capture of their main fortress of La Rochelle (1628), which from the year 1568 had been virtually an independent republic; but he pardoned them on the single condition of laying down their arms and swearing fidelity to their king, and expressly guaranteed to them the free exercise of their religion by the treaty of Alais in 1629.

PERSECUTION OF THE HUGUENOTS UNDER LOUIS XIV.

With the long reign of Louis XIV. (1643–1715), the most brilliant and most despotic of French kings, and yet the slave of women, began without cause and provocation a series of systematic and cold-blooded vexations and persecutions of the Huguenots, which forms one of the most disgraceful chapters in the history of France.†

He was educated in the Roman Church and early formed the conviction that the unity of the State and the nation required unity of religion. He could not bear the idea that any of his subjects should differ from him, and deem their religion better than his. He wanted to be absolute monarch over his subjects, with his will as the supreme law. He was the embodiment of state-craft. His motto was "*L'état c'est moi.*"

---

* See the details in the second chapter of Weiss, *History of the French Prot. Refugees*, Vol. I., 49 *sqq.*, and sketches of all these distinguished Huguenots in *La France Protestante.*

† Martin (XIV., 54) says that history records greater effusions of blood, "*mais aucun spectacle ne blesse au même point le sens moral et l'humanité, que cette persécution exercée à froid et d'après des idées abstraites, sans l'excuse de la lutte et du danger, sans la fièvre ardente des batailles et des révolutions.*"

He wished to crown his military conquests by the extermination of heresy, and was encouraged in it by his advisers. He hoped thereby to conciliate the Pope, whom he made his enemy by the Gallican liberties, and to atone for his many adulterous amours. These political and religious motives drew him step by step into a course of actions which made his otherwise glorious and prosperous reign most inglorious and ruinous in its ultimate consequences. He aspired to become "Louis the Great," but he only reached the distinction of "the Great Monarch" with his flatterers and admirers, and even that title is marred by his bigotry, cruelty and licentiousness.

When a youth of eighteen, he declared (July 18th, 1656) that he had "always considered the Edict of Nantes as a singular work of the perfect prudence of Henry the Great, our grandfather." But he acted on the opposite view after the year 1661. He withdrew one privilege after another from the Huguenots. The legal tribunals supported him by giving the least favorable interpretation to the legislative provisions for their protection, and the most favorable interpretation to the laws for the dominant Church. Whatever was not expressly granted to the Huguenots in the Edict of Nantes was denied them. Conversion to Protestantism was prohibited under heavy penalties, while conversion to Romanism was facilitated in every way by promises and threats. The Protestants were gradually removed from the offices of state and professions of emolument; even women were denied the humble avocations of midwives, milliners and laundresses. Their "temples" were destroyed or confiscated when they stood inconveniently near the parish church, when the sound of psalm-singing disturbed the solemn mass, or when no clear title of the land could be produced. Thus Béarn, the mother province of French Protestantism, lost fifteen out of twenty churches at a stroke of the pen; the remaining five were destroyed in May, 1685, and the Protestant preachers expelled from the province that the Jesuits might begin their work of conversion without hindrance. The Chambers of the Edict were abolished. The colleges of Sedan, Montpellier, Saumur and Montauban were closed, and the buildings given over to the Jesuits. Huguenot school-

masters were forbidden to teach anything but reading, writing and arithmetic. All preaching and writing against Catholicism were strictly interdicted. Infants must be baptized within twenty-four hours by priests, if no Protestant preacher was within reach, as was often the case. A child of seven years was permitted to profess the Roman religion against the will of the parents, and could not afterwards return to Protestantism. Emigration was forbidden, and the half of the goods of the emigrants was promised to the informers.

These iniquitous measures were crowned by the infamous dragonades. Companies of coarse troopers were billeted in times of peace upon the families of the Huguenots, in order to force their wholesale conversion or ruin by every kind of violence short of rape and deliberate murder. This was done in all the districts except that of Paris, where the King wished to appear humane and enlightened. The dragoons turned the parlors into stables, broke the furniture, compelled the proprietors to furnish them with every delicacy of the market, insulted women with ribald jests and songs, disturbed the night's rest and made life unendurable.

Let us hear the reports of the best-informed French historians.

"The soldiers," reports Benoît, a contemporary historian,* "offered indignities to the women which modesty does not suffer me to describe. The officers were no better than the soldiers. They spat in the women's faces; they made them lie down in their presence upon burning coals; they forced them to put their heads in ovens, the vapor of which was hot enough to suffocate them. Their chief study was to discover torments which should be painful without being mortal."

"In many villages," says Professor Charles Weiss,† "the priests followed the dragoons through the streets, crying: 'Courage, gentlemen; it is the intention of the king that these dogs of Huguenots should be pillaged and sacked.' The soldiers entered the houses, sword in hand, sometimes

---

* *Hist. of the Ed. of Nantes*, Book XII., Vol. V., p. 833 *sq.*

† *Hist. of the French Prot. Refugees*, I., 93 *sq.*

crying 'Kill! kill!' to frighten the women and children. So long as the inhabitants could satisfy their rapacity, they suffered no worse than pillage. But when their money was expended, the price of their furniture consumed, and the ornaments and garments of their wives disposed of, the dragoons either seized them by the hair to drag them to church; or, if they suffered them to remain in their houses, they made use of threats, outrages and even tortures to compel them to be converted. They burnt, at slow fires, the feet and hands of some; they broke the ribs, legs or arms of others with blows of sticks. Many had their lips burned with hot irons. Others were cast into damp dungeons, with threats of leaving them there to rot. The soldiers said that everything was permitted to them, except murder and rape."

The same writer gives several cases of the barbarous cruelty of these persecutions. An old gentleman of Nîmes, named M. de Lacassaque, after having been robbed of his sleep for many days, at last professed submission to the Roman Church. "Behold, now you may take your rest," said the Bishop Séquier. "Alas, my lord," replied the unfortunate man, "I no longer expect rest, but in heaven, and God grant that what I have done this day may not close its gate upon me." His wife, disguised as a servant-maid, was wandering through the woods, where many of the women were overtaken with the pains of childbirth. A pastor at Bordeaux, a brother of Bayle, was thrown by the order of Louvois into a dungeon, called "The Hell," and kept there for five months till death delivered him from his torments. The victims in these horrible dungeons "could not remain standing, sitting or lying at length. They were let down into them with ropes, and were drawn up again every day to have inflicted upon them scourgings, either with a stick or the strappado. Many, after a few weeks' imprisonment, issued from the dungeons of Grenoble without hair or teeth."

These cruelties had their effect upon weak human nature. The sufferers sought refuge in flight or insincere submission. "The dragoons," wrote Madame de Sévigné, "have been very good missionaries; the preachers who will be sent presently

will render the work perfect." The governors of the provinces sent to the King exaggerated reports monthly and weekly of thousands of so-called new converts (*nouveaux convertis*), 60,000 in the district of Bordeaux, 20,000 in and around Montauban, 30,000 in Dauphiné, etc., without informing him of the means employed, or letting the complaints of the persecuted reach his ears, and made him believe that Protestantism was annihilated in France.

In this belief he was strengthened and encouraged to take the final step of revocation by his courtiers and advisers, especially by Louvois, his minister of war; Père la Chaise, his confessor; and Madame de Maintenon, his last mistress, the most influential woman in France, who had herself been a Calvinist (being the granddaughter of Agrippa d'Aubigné, a friend of Henry IV., and leader of the Huguenots by sword and pen), but was all the more zealous for her new faith, and acquired complete control over the head and heart of her royal lover, who secretly married her in 1684.

REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES.

In the year 1685 the King revoked the "irrevocable" Edict of his grandfather by a formal decree, signed by his hand at Fontainebleau on the 18th* and registered on the 22nd of October, eighty-seven years after the Edict of Nantes and seventy-five years after the death of Henry IV. It was one of the darkest days in the history of France and the history of liberty.

In the Edict of Revocation, Louis XIV., after declaring that the greatest part of his Protestant subjects had embraced the Catholic religion and made the Edict of Nantes useless, prohibits the worship of Protestants, orders the immediate destruction of their temples, the closing of their schools, the banishment of their ministers within a fortnight on pain of death, and the Roman Catholic baptism of every new-born babe; while laymen are forbidden to leave the country, the

* Or 17th. The Edict gives only the month.

men under peril of being condemned for life to the galleys, the women to perpetual imprisonment.

A series of proclamations followed from time to time to enforce this measure of injustice and cruelty.

The Edict extended also to the French colonies in America. The King informed the Governor de Denonville of Canada, in May, 1686, of the brilliant success of the Revocation in France, and instructed him to quarter his troops in the houses of any remaining Huguenots, or to imprison them, but to be careful to accompany this rigorous treatment with the necessary provisions for their religious instruction, to be procured from the bishop. The Governor informed him that there was not a heretic in Canada.* For the Huguenots were excluded from emigrating to New France in 1633, and the settlement given into the hands of Jesuit missionaries, whose heroic labors among the Indians in the Northwest deserve all credit. The conflict of England and France for the possession of North America ended with the defeat of France. But the French Canadians are as a mass to this day as ignorant and bigoted as their ancestors in the age of Louis XIV., which is stereotyped and petrified, as it were, in the province of Quebec.

On the very day when the Edict of Revocation was registered (October 22nd), the destruction of the eight hundred Protestant houses of worship began with the demolition of the large temple of Charenton, and the erection of a cross with the royal arms on the ruins.† Of the temple of Nîmes a solitary stone was accidentally left, which bore the inscription: "Here is the house of God, here is the gate of heaven."

France had at that time about a million and a half of Protestants among twenty millions of inhabitants.‡

---

* Ch. W. Baird, *Hist. of the Hug. Emigration to America*, I., 126.

† See a picture of the temple in Bordier and Charton, *Histoire de France*, II., 194, and its destruction, p. 282, and a description in the *Bulletin historique et littéraire* of the "Society of the History of French Protestantism" for Sept. and Oct., 1885, p. 388 *sqq*.

‡ This is the estimate of Martin, XIV., 54, after deducting the loss sustained by conversions and emigration in the preceding twenty years, which Jurieu estimates at more than 200,000. Contemporary estimates vary between 800,000 and 2,000,000.

APPROVAL OF THE REVOCATION BY THE ROMAN CLERGY AND THE POPE.

Le Tellier, who prepared and countersigned the Revocation, died a few days after (October 31st), with the song of Simeon, "Now lettest Thou Thy servant depart, O Lord, in peace." The Gallican Church, through its most eminent bishops and pulpit orators, with a few noble exceptions, as that of Fénelon, congratulated the infatuated King on this inglorious and disastrous deed. The great Bossuet, with all his zeal for the Gallican liberties which he formulated in 1682, hated and combatted Protestantism as a deadly heresy, and took the lead in blind laudations of Louis. He called him a new Constantine, a new Theodosius, a new Marcian, a new Charlemagne, who established the faith, who exterminated the heretics. "Through your exertions," he addressed the King, "heresy exists no longer. God alone could perform this miracle. King of heaven, preserve the king of the earth, is the prayer of the churches, is the prayer of the bishops."* Fléchier expressed the same enthusiastic joy over the destruction of heresy. Abbé Tallemant after the razing of the Protestant church at Charenton, exclaimed before the French Academy: "Happy ruins! which are the finest trophy France has ever seen. . . . There is nothing but the fable of the vanquished hydra, which can aid us to express in some degree our feelings of admiration at this astonishing victory." Massillon, in his funeral oration on Louis XIV., eulogized chiefly his great "victory over heresy," which fell at his first blow and was forced "either to conceal itself in the darkness from which it emerged, or to cross the sea and to carry with it its false gods, its wrath and its bitterness into foreign lands."† The clergy echoed these laudations. Municipal corporations, courts of justice, academies and universities rivaled in expressions of admiration for the King; medals were struck, which represent him crowned by Religion for having brought back to

---

* Cardinal Hergenröther (*Kirchengesch.*, III., 433) calls Bossuet the "church father of liberal Catholic theology, which would kiss the Pope's toe, but bind his hands and make the Church a tool of the State."

† Weiss, I., 123.

the Church two millions of Calvinists; statues were erected to "the destructor of heresy."

Pope Innocent XI., forgetting for a moment his quarrel with Louis XIV., on account of the assertion of the Gallican liberties, which deny the infallibility and temporal power of the Pope, praised him, in answer to official information, for an action fully worthy of "the most Christian king" (Nov. 16th, 1685), and celebrated the Revocation with a *Te Deum* (March, 1686), as his predecessor had celebrated the massacre of St. Bartholomew.*

THE VERDICT OF HISTORY.

The verdict of history differs widely from Louis XIV., Bossuet and the Pope. Catholic France was by no means unanimous in the approval of the Revocation, even at that time. The Duke de Saint-Simon, a courtier of Louis XIV., a great writer and a good Catholic (a zealous Jansenist and friend of Fénelon), was only ten years of age when the Edict of Revocation was issued, but lived long enough to see its

---

* The brief is printed in Latin and French in *Edits, Déclarations et Arrêts concernant la religion prétendue réformée* (Paris, 1885), p. 605 *sq.* The Pope begins: "*Carissime in Christo fili noster,*" etc. "*Cum præ cæteris illustribus documentis quæ ingenitam Majestatis tuæ pietatem abunde declarant, maxime excellat eximius ille regeque christianissimo dignus plane zelus, quo strenue incensus faventes istius regni hæreticis constitutiones penitus abrogasti, fideique orthodoxæ propagationi sapientissimis editis decretis egregie consuluisti, sicut nobis exposuit dilectus filius, nobilis vir dux d'Estrées,*" etc. The Pope predicts: "*Recensebit profecto suis in fastis catholica ecclesia tam grande tuæ erga ipsam devotionis opus, nomenque tuum non interituris præconiis prosequetur.*"

Dr. Döllinger (*Kirche und Kirchen*, 1861, p. xxxiii.) and Cardinal Hergenröther (*Kirchengeschichte*, III., 597, 3d ed., 1886) assert that Pope Innocent disapproved the persecution. But he merely disapproved, in a roundabout way, the novel and uncatholic method of converting heretics by dragoons or "armed apostles," and tried to restrain James II. from his suicidal folly. I am glad, however, that such a Catholic scholar and dignitary as Hergenröther condemns the "terrible severity" of Louis XIV., though he prudently (must we not say, unfairly?) ignores the approval of Bossuet and the other lights of the French pulpit, as well as the *Te Deum* sung in Rome. His words are: "*Sowohl französische Bischöfe, wie Fénelon, als Papst Innocenz XI. missbilligten die furchtbare Härte; letzerer liess durch den Nuntius d'Adda in London den König Jacob II. zu Vorstellungen dagegen aufmuntern.*"

consequences, and described them in the darkest, yet most truthful colors. The voice of Protestant Europe condemned it, and answered by offers of hospitality to the victims of persecution. Among modern historians there is scarcely a difference of opinion on the subject.

The Revocation was a moral crime, a political blunder and a national disaster. It deprived France of many thousands of her best citizens, ruined her manufactures and commerce, subjected her for a long time to the pillage of the dragoons, brought untold misery upon individuals, families and communities, armed parents against children and children against parents, covered the land with hypocrisy, perjury and sacrilege, roused the indignation of the Protestant world, filled the refugees with hatred of their native country, and was the remote cause of the French Revolution.*

We may go even further, and say that the recent humiliation of France in the war of 1870 was the result of the policy of Louis XIV. with his Protestant subjects, and of his unjust wars against Holland and Germany, the savage devastation of the Palatinate and the robbery of Strasburg. When the German historian Ranke met the French historian and statesman Thiers at Vienna, after the downfall of the second empire at Sedan, he is reported to have told him that the Germans were making war, not upon Napoleon, nor the empire, nor the republic, still less upon the French people, but upon Louis

---

* This is substantially the judgment of the Duke de Saint-Simon, in his *Mémoirs*, ch. 313, quoted in French by Bordier (II., 282 *sq.*), and in English by Ch. W. Baird, *Hist. of the Hug. Emigration to America*, I., 259. Comp. also the spirited summary in Voltaire's *Siècle de Louis XIV.*, the judgments of Martin, Bordier, Weiss and other historians. Dr. Döllinger, in an essay on Louis XIV. (*Akademische Vorträge*, 1888, Vol. I., 311), makes the striking remark, that that man would have been the greatest benefactor of the king and of France, who with the authority of a Hebrew prophet would have warned him in 1685 to this effect: Do not revoke the Edict of Nantes! You will forge a chain of oppressions; you will make more hypocrites than believers, and desecrate the sacred rites of the Church; you will drive hundreds of thousands of the most conscientious citizens out of the land; you will inflame bloody civil wars; you will alienate the hearts of foreign nations; you will raise a generation of infidels who will overthrow your throne and persecute and destroy your Church, which now offers you the weapons and instruments against the sons of your people.

Quatorze; whereupon Thiers wondered at the long memory of the Germans.

THE GREAT EXODUS.*

The Revocation forced the Protestant ministers to leave the country, and the laymen to remain at home. Now the emigration which had begun in the early stages of the persecution assumed the proportion of a vast exodus, which may be compared to the exodus of Israel from the oppression of Pharaoh, and forms one of the most glorious, as the Revocation forms one of the most inglorious, chapters in the history of the French people. The Huguenot emigration for the sake of religion throws all similar emigrations into the shade. No church can boast of a larger army of confessors and martyrs of conscience than the Calvinistic Churches of France and of Holland.

The Huguenots as a rule were superior to the mass of the Roman Catholic population outside of Paris in intelligence, industry and virtue, and the emigrants were the élite of the Huguenots, including such distinguished names as Claude, Jurieu, Bayle, Basnage, Lenfant, Beausobre, Abbadie, Saurin, Ancillon, Tronchin, Constant, Candolle, Denis Papin, de Blois, not to count the much larger number of their equally distinguished descendants in other countries.

Their high moral character is shown by the very fact of their emigration. They left their property and native land in

---

* On the Huguenot emigration and settlements in foreign lands, see the following works besides those already quoted:—CHARLES WEISS (Professor of History in the Lycée Bonaparte): *Histoire des refugiés protestants de France*, Paris, 1853, 2 vols. (English translation by W. H. Herbert, N. Y., 1854). SAM. SMILES: *The Huguenots, their Settlements, Churches, and Industries in England and Ireland*, London, 1867 (Am. ed. with appendix by G. P. Disosway, N. Y., 1867). R. LANE POOLE: *History of the Huguenots of the Dispersion at the Recall of the Edict of Nantes*, London, 1880. DAVID C. A. AGNEW (of the Free Church of Scotland): *Protestant Exiles from France, chiefly in the Reign of Louis XIV.*; or, *The Huguenot Refugees and their Descendants in Great Britain and Ireland*. London and Edinburgh, 1866; second ed., 1871, in 3 vols.; third ed., 1886, in 2 large vols. C. W. BAIRD: *History of the Huguenot Emigration to America*, New York, 1882, 2 vols. The *Collections of the* HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF AMERICA, New York, 1886 *sqq.*

obedience to their conscience and at the risk of their lives. They showed their heroism in flight under the greatest hardships, in constant dread of the heartless pursuers. They made their way to a place of safety, singly or with women and children, in all sorts of disguise,—as pilgrims, as couriers, as sportsmen with their guns upon the shoulder, as peasants driving cattle,—on untrodden roads, travelling by night and passing the day in forests or caverns, hid under bales of goods and heaps of coal or in empty casks on English and Dutch merchant vessels. "Persons brought up in every luxury, pregnant women, old men, invalids and children rivaled each other in constancy, hoping to escape their persecutors."

Those who were caught in the flight had to endure the extreme hardships of the galleys at Marseilles and Toulon, chained two and two, plying the long and heavy oars, exposed to the heat of the day and the chill of the night, without being able to change their position beyond the length of their chain.

Men made of such stuff and capable of such sacrifices are worthy of a place of honor and glory among the heroes of faith and "the noble army of martyrs."

The total number of French refugees cannot be exactly ascertained, and is variously stated at 300,000 up to a million. Counting all the Huguenots who emigrated before and after the Revocation, for the sake of religion, half a million is probably not too high an estimate.*

---

* Vauban counted 100,000 from 1684 to 1691; Jurieu more than 200,000 in 1687; Benoît 200,000 in 1695; Basnage, an illustrious refugee, speaks vaguely of from 300,000 to 400,000; others swell the number still more; while Martin (XIV., 59) and Bordier (II., 283) reduce it to 250,000, but only from the Revocation to the beginning of the following century. Professor Charles Weiss (Vol. I., p. 3 of the English translation) estimates the number of refugees during the last fifteen years of the seventeenth century at from 250,000 to 300,000, and gives several details of the diminution of the population in various cities and provinces according to the official reports of 1698, but these reports are incomplete, and cover only a few years. The population of La Rochelle decreased more than one-third. Of 1,938 Protestant families in the district of Paris, 1,202 emigrated, and only 731 remained behind. In the district of Meaux, 1,000 families out of 1,500 made their escape. In Burgundy about one-third of the Protestants expatriated themselves. Normandy, which had formerly at least 200,000 Protestant families, suffered most. In Picardy, as in

THE HUGUENOTS IN FOREIGN LANDS.

The loss of France was a gain to foreign lands. The curse of the Revocation was turned into a blessing. Providence overrules the counsels of bad men, and brings good out of evil.

The Huguenot refugees excited the active sympathy of all Protestant countries, and found new homes in Switzerland, England, Holland, Germany, Denmark, Sweden and in the colonies of North America. They enriched the lands of their adoption by their intelligence, industry, virtue and the charms of refined manners. Their names and those of their descendants are on honorable record in the theological, literary, political and military history of those countries.

Those who emigrated to Holland and England lent effectual aid as private soldiers and officers, trained under Turenne and Condé, to William of Orange in the Revolution of 1688, and the defeat of the Jacobite rebellion in Ireland, aided by Louis XIV., in the following year. In the battle of the Boyne (July 1st, 1690) the Huguenots first crossed the river under the command of Count de Schomberg, who addressed them: "Come, friends, remember your courage and your griefs; your persecutors are before you." Such acts of retaliation, which transplanted the civil war to foreign soil, are, of course, offensive to French patriotism, and obscure the fame of bravery. But the great majority devoted themselves to the arts of peace, greatly enlarged the commerce and navigation, and introduced or improved the manufacture of silks, linen, hats, tapestry. Allix, Abbadie and Jacques Saurin (before his call to the Hague in 1705) graced the pulpits of London with their eloquence.*

The greatness of Prussia dates from that period, and was promoted by the French Reformed element. In the same month in which Louis XIV. signed the Revocation of the

---

Normandy, the vicinity of the sea favored the escape into Holland and England. Pastor N. Weiss (secretary and librarian of the "Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme français") estimates the whole number of refugees at from 500.000 to 600,000. See his *La Sortie de France pour cause de religion de Daniel Brousson et de sa famille*, Paris, 1885, p. vi.

* Weiss, *l. c.*, I., 267 *sqq.*

Edict, Frederick William, the great Elector of Brandenburg (who had received a French Protestant education at the court of the princes of Orange, and married Louisa Henrietta, a daughter of the Stadtholder Frederick Henry and a descendant of Admiral Coligny), signed at Potsdam an Edict expressive of warm sympathy with the persecuted Huguenots, and offering inducements to those who might wish to settle in his dominions (October 29th, 1685). He received about 20,000 refugees, including such distinguished scholars as Lenfant, Beausobre, Vignole, Lacroze, Abbadie (who afterwards settled in England), able journalists, skilled artisans and brave officers. He made liberal provision from his private purse for their temporal and spiritual needs in Berlin and other cities. "I will sell," he said, "my silver plate before they shall suffer want." Several Huguenot churches remain to this day living monuments of that noble hospitality, which has borne rich fruit in subsequent history down to the victories of the Franco-German War of 1870.

It should be added, however, that he did not permit the free development of the presbyterian and synodical self-government which would interfere with his summepiscopate.

Huguenot colonies settled also in Halle, Magdeburg, Stendal, Halberstadt, Calb, Spandau, Königsberg, Hamburg, Frankfort-on-the-Oder, Frankfort-on-the-Main, Cassel, Hanau, Friedrichsdorf in Hesse and other places of Germany, and have in part preserved the French language in public worship to this day.*

In American history the influence of the Huguenot element is very conspicuous, and out of proportion to the extent of immigration. It may be traced in the French names of our patriots, statesmen, philanthropists and ministers of the gospel. One of the chaplains of the old Continental Congress,

---

* Comp. Charles Ancillon, *Histoire de l'établissement des Refugiés dans les États de son Altesse Électorale de Brandenbourg*, 1690. Weiss, *l. c.*, Book II. (p. 127 *sqq.*). E. Muret, *Geschichte der französischen Kolonie in Brandenburg-Preussen*, 1885. Henri Tollin, *Geschichte der französischen Colonie von Magdeburg*, Halle, 1886–'87, 2 vols. In the first volume (p. 740), Tollin gives a full general history of Huguenot emigration to Germany.

during the War of Independence, Jacob Duché, of Philadelphia; three of the seven Presidents of that Congress, Henry Laurens, of South Carolina, John Jay, of New York, Elias Boudinot, of New Jersey; two of the four commissioners who signed the treaty of peace at Paris in 1782, Laurens and Jay; the first Chief-Justice of the State of New York and the second Chief-Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, John Jay, were descendants of French Protestant refugees, and gave their influence to the establishment of the new republic on the basis of political and religious freedom. John Jay was also, as joint editor with Hamilton and Madison of *The Federalist*, one of the chief advocates and expounders of the Federal Constitution.

THE CHURCH OF THE DÉSERT.*

Louis XIV. vainly believed and declared, March 8th, 1715, that God had blessed his "pious intentions" to bring back the heretics and their children to the true church. But the Protestant religion was not dead in France; it was only buried alive and continued to breathe, and at last burst the coffin. For a century the Reformed Church of France lived as a Church of the Désert, like the burning bush which it has chosen for its device, "*Flagror, non consumor.*" More than one-half of the Huguenots could or would not flee from their native land, and yet adhered to their faith in the face of confiscation, torture and death. They met for worship in forests, on the mountains, in caverns, under cover of the night. The awful silence of nature, the flickering torches, the reading of

---

* On this most interesting period of the French Reformed Church, I refer to CHARLES COQUEREL: *Histoire des Églises du Désert*, Paris, 1841. O. DOUEN: *Les premiers pasteurs du désert* (1685–1700), Paris, 1879, 2 vols. EDMOND HUGUES: *Histoire de la Restauration du Protestantisme en France au XVIIIe siècle—Antoine Court—d'après des documents inédits*, Paris, 1875, 2 vols. *Les Synodes du Désert*, Paris, 1885, 2 vols., by the same. A. P. DARDIER: *Paul Rabaut, ses lettres à Antoine Court* (1739–1755). *Dix-sept ans de la vie d'un apôtre du désert*, Paris (n. d.). The earlier work of A. VINET: *Histoire de la Prédication parmi les Réformés de France au dix-septième siècle*, Paris, 1860 (1841), comes down to Jacques Saurin (1677–1730), but belongs more properly to the previous period.

the Prophets, the plaintive strains of the Psalms, the solemn prayers, the sudden interruptions by the cries of sentinels, created a morbid excitement of religious feelings, and gave rise to a set of enthusiasts and visionaries who took the place of regular pastors and believed themselves inspired by God. They stirred up the revolt of the Camisards in the Cévennes, but it was soon put down by the armies of Louis XIV.

During that critical period, Providence raised a man of truly apostolic zeal and wisdom, Antoine Court (March 27th, 1695–June 15th, 1760), pastor at Nîmes, who consecrated his whole life to the Protestant Church of France, and is justly called its "Restorer." He collected the scattered members, called them from wild enthusiasm to sobriety, organized them into regular churches and established a seminary of learning at Lausanne for the training of ministers.

Paul Rabaut (1718–1792) continued this work in a faithful ministry of fifty years till his death, and lived to rejoice over the Edict of Toleration in 1787, when he could exclaim with Simeon's song, "Now lettest Thou depart Thy servant, O Lord, in peace." What a contrast to Chancellor Le Tellier, who departed with the same song after signing the Edict of Revocation.

The ministers trained for the Church of the Désert by Court and Rabaut were no great scholars or divines, but, what is more important, sincere and devoted Christians, zealous evangelists and faithful pastors.

The resurrection of the Huguenot Church and its continuance for a hundred years in spite of legal prohibition and systematic persecution by the State, is a marvel without a parallel in history, except in the Church of the first three centuries. The Huguenots were not even allowed to bury their dead in consecrated ground. The last case of a dragonade was the dispersion and arrest of a religious meeting in 1767 in a cavern of Orange, which served as a temple, but the prisoners were discharged without process, since they were only found guilty of mutual prayer and edification. The last preacher of "the désert" who was condemned to death for preaching the gospel, ascended the gallows with the old Huguenot hymn,

La voici l'heureuse journée. The day of deliverance was at hand. The midnight was past, the day was breaking.

The number of Calvinists in 1760 according to their calculation was 593,307, of whom 337,307 were entered by the pastors in their registers.* This number was considerably smaller than that before 1685, but very great under the circumstances, for every Protestant was true to his faith at the risk of exile or death. They had no aspiration to become a political party, as their ancestors had been before Richelieu; they were peaceful and patriotic, and never neglected to pray for the King and the government. The Parliament of Rouen which was not favorable to them, called them erring Christians, but loyal subjects of the King and valuable citizens of the State.

France rejected the Reformation and reaped the Revolution. The tyranny of Romanism provoked infidelity. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes was followed by the temporary destruction of the Church in France.

The eighteenth century is the century of infidelity, which had its head-quarters in Paris. Voltaire (1694–1778) was its chief apostle, who ruled as an absolute monarch in the realm of literature. He was a master-architect of ruin, but unable to build up. He was essentially a mocker, though not without noble impulses for justice, liberty and humanity. Frederick the Great admired his genius but despised his character, and ascribed to him all the agility and malice of a monkey. Voltaire knew the Christian religion only in a distorted form, which it had assumed under Louis XIV. and Louis XV. in connection with worldliness and political despotism, and he never took the trouble to study seriously its true character in the Bible and in history. He hated the Roman Church of his day as the mother of superstition and the enemy of all freedom and progress. He employed his inexhaustible resources of sarcasm, irony and ridicule for her destruction. He gave expression to his malignant hatred in the terrible phrase, "Crush the wretch,"

**Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du Protest. Français*, 1886, p. 472. The present number is not much larger. It must be confessed that Protestantism has not made as much progress since 1787 as might have been expected from its vitality and intellectual and moral strength.

which frequently occurs in his works, and especially in his private letters. By the infamous wretch he meant no more or less than the Roman Church as a hierarchical institution, the intolerant, persecuting, Jesuitical Church of the Inquisition and the Revocation.*

But while we deplore his infidelity, we must give him credit for his triumphant advocacy of religious toleration, by which he revolutionized public opinion in France. This is his noblest deed. He went to great trouble and expense to rescue the memory of Jean Calas and to cause the reversion of his unjust condemnation, and thereby he dealt a death blow to the system of religious persecution.

THE TRIAL OF JEAN CALAS.

Jean Calas was a worthy Protestant merchant of Toulouse, and father of four sons and two daughters. One of his sons hung himself in a fit of melancholy, October 13th, 1761. A rumor arose that the unfortunate youth intended to profess the Roman religion the next day, and that the father had strangled him to prevent his conversion. The clergy stirred up the fanatical passions of the populace. Calas was arrested, accused

---

* "*Écrasez l'infâme.*" The word *infâme, infamous,* is also used as a noun in the sense of a convicted criminal, an infamous man or woman. Voltaire uses it as a feminine. It is often asserted, but denied by the best authorities, that he meant Christianity or even Christ. The writer of the Art. "Voltaire" in Pierre Larousse's *Grand Dict. universel du XIX. Siècle,* Tome XV., 1181, says that Voltaire by that phrase certainly intended no more than to designate "*la superstition, le fanatisme et l'intolérance, restes impurs du moyen âge, qui non seulement n'ont rien de religieux, mais sont même subversifs de toute idée religieuse.*" The same writer states that Voltaire was no atheist, but simply a deist, and that he returned in his later writings more and more from skepticism to deism. When Franklin asked him to bless his grandson, he laid his hands on him with the words, "*Dieu et la liberté.*" G. Saintsbury, in the *Encycl. Britannica,* Vol. XXIV., 292 (9th ed.), takes a similar view: "*L'infâme* is not God; it is not Christ; it is not Christianity; it is not even Catholicism. Its briefest equivalent may be given as 'persecuting and privileged orthodoxy' in general, and, more particularly, it is the particular system which Voltaire saw around him, of which he had felt the effects in his own exiles and the confiscations of his books, and of which he saw the still worse effects in the hideous sufferings of Calas and La Barre." Compare also the discussion of the phrase by Strauss, *Voltaire,* p. 188 *sq.*, and Zeller, *Friedrich der Grosse als Philosoph,* p. 144 *sqq.*

by false witnesses, condemned by the Parliament of Toulouse, and broken alive on the wheel, March 10th, 1762. He protested his innocence to the last breath, bore his sufferings without a murmur and prayed God not to punish his judges, who were no doubt deceived by false witnesses. His little property was confiscated, and his children were imprisoned in a convent; but two sons escaped to Geneva. The revision of the process proved the complete innocence of Calas. The verdict of the highest legal tribunal of Paris unanimously reversed the verdict of the Parliament of Toulouse (March 9th, 1765); the property was restored to the family; and the King made the widow (who died an octogenarian in 1792) a present of thirty thousand francs; but the guilty parties were not punished.*

The case of Calas interested all France—yea, all Europe; it elicited no less than 145 publications, and was also brought upon the stage. The verdict of Toulouse was the last act of Huguenot persecution; the verdict of Paris was the death of the Edict of Revocation.

VOLTAIRE'S THEORY OF TOLERATION.

Voltaire did not defend Calas as a Protestant, but as an injured citizen. He cared no more for Protestantism as a religion than for Catholicism, but he did care for the natural rights of man and for justice. He exposed the case in his *Tract on Toleration* which appeared first in 1763, in several editions and languages, and had a most extensive circulation and a powerful effect.† When he held his last triumphant entry in Paris, he was hailed as "the Defender of Calas and Sirven."

He advocated toleration as a right of justice, a duty of humanity, a condition of the prosperity of the State and as the only basis of peace between the State and religion and the different religions. Toleration promotes population. It alone

---

* Comp. Athan. Coquerel, Jr., *Jean Calas et sa famille*, Paris, 1858; 2d ed., 1869 (with all the documents, 527 pp.); Herzog, *Die Familie Calas und Voltaire*, 1868; Kohler, *Die Familie Calas*, Hamburg, 1871; *La France Protest.*, Vol. III., 471 *sqq.*, 2d ed. (1881). The work of Coquerel is exhaustive.

† "*Traité sur la Tolérance à l'occasion de la mort de Jean Calas.*" Voltaire frequently speaks of toleration in his letters to D'Alembert.

makes society endurable. The Christian religion, he thought, ought to be the most tolerant, because Christians have been the most tolerant among men.

Yet Voltaire, Rousseau and the other French freethinkers of the eighteenth century maintained the right of the civil ruler over the religion of his country. Voltaire recognized (as he wrote to Catherine II.) only the temporal power, which may forbid any dogma contrary to the public good. Dissenters from the established religion should always be obliged to apply to the magistrate to hold their assemblies. Rousseau taught that all believers in an exclusive religion (that is, all Roman Catholics) should be banished, because such a belief was incompatible with the safety and tranquillity of society.

Through the influence of Voltaire, Rousseau and the Encyclopædists the doctrine of toleration, in conjunction with indifference and infidelity, pervaded French society and reduced the intolerant legislation of Louis XIV. to a dead letter. The leaders of public opinion were nominally Catholics (except Rousseau, who was a native of the city of Calvin), and even Voltaire confessed his sins to a priest before his death to insure decent burial.

Contemporary events greatly promoted the cause of religious liberty. The Toleration Edict of Joseph II. in 1781 found an echo in France and in all Europe. But a still greater effect must be ascribed to the triumph of American independence, which was achieved with the diplomatic and military aid of France, and to the Constitutional Convention of 1787, which made religious liberty the law of the United States. It is well known with what honor Benjamin Franklin was treated in Paris. General Lafayette, on his return from America, acted as a mediator and friend of both countries, and freely advocated the principle of civil and religious liberty. He travelled under the pretext of business to Nîmes and other places of the south where Protestants were numerous, made the acquaintance of Pastor Rabaut (1785), and exerted his influence upon the King, who esteemed him very highly as the restorer of the military glory of France.

III

TOLERATION RESTORED.*

At last toleration was restored in France, and Protestantism once more was recognized by law. Louis XV., although himself a sincere Catholic, prepared the way for this act of justice. He signed an Edict of Toleration, November 17th, 1787, which granted to his Protestant subjects, in thirty-seven Articles, civil rights as regards birth, marriage and burial. He declared: "After the example of our predecessors, we shall always favor, with all our power, the means of instruction and persuasion, which may tend to bind our subjects in the common profession of the ancient faith of our kingdom; and we shall proscribe, with the utmost severity, all those violent means which are as contrary to the principles of reason and humanity as to the true spirit of Christianity. But while we wait till Divine Providence shall bless our efforts, and bring about this happy revolution, our justice and the interest of our kingdom permit us no longer to exclude from civil rights those of our subjects and of strangers, domiciled in our empire, who do not profess the Roman Catholic religion. A sufficiently long experience has demonstrated that rigorous proceedings are insufficient to convert them. We must, therefore, no longer permit our laws to punish them for the misfortune of their birth, by depriving them of rights which nature must incessantly demand in their behalf."

The toleration granted was very limited indeed, and fell short even of the Edict of Nantes and the Toleration Edict of Joseph II.; it carefully avoided the very name "Protestant" and "Reformed," and excluded them expressly from the chairs of teachers and judges, and from the right of holding property as corporations, but it was the entering wedge for further progress. The clergy held a convention in July, 1788, and protested against this little morsel of freedom which had been given to heretics without consulting the bishops and the Pope, but the Revolution swept over all reactionary tendencies.

---

* Theodor Schott, *Das Toleranzedict Ludwigs XVI.*, in H. von Sybel's "Historische Zeitschrift," vol. xxv. (München & Leipzig, 1889), pp. 385–425.

The Constituent Convention of 1789 went a step beyond the Edict of the King, and overthrew the barriers which still kept the Protestants from public offices. It declared (August 21st) all citizens to be equal in the eyes of the law, and equally admissible to all public dignities according to their abilities, and passed a decree (August 23rd) that "No person ought to be troubled on account of his opinions, even though they be religious, provided that their manifestation do not disturb the public order as instituted by law." By a singular nemesis of history, Saint-Étienne Rabaut, the oldest of the three sons of Paul Rabaut, was elected President of the National Assembly, and could write to his aged father March 15th, 1790: "The National Assembly lies at your feet." He boldly demanded not toleration simply, but liberty and justice to Protestants. He contributed much to the triumph of this principle, but as a moderate monarchist he fell a victim to the Reign of Terror, and was executed December 5th, 1793.

A law of December 15th, 1790, gave the descendants of French refugees, on returning to France and making it their home, all the rights of citizenship, and promised them restoration of such confiscated property as was not sold *bona fide* but still under sequestration. The Republican Constitution of June 24th, 1793, Article VII., says in language similar to that of the First Amendment of the American Constitution: "The right of communicating thoughts and opinions, either through the press or in any other manner; the right of assembling peacefully; *the free exercise of religion*, cannot be prohibited."

It is true that the toleration of the infidel school of Voltaire and the Encyclopædists ended in the greatest intolerance,—even the extermination of the Christian religion under the Reign of Terror. Voltaire's *Écrasez l'infâme* was literally carried into effect, even beyond his intention; and the worship of reason was substituted for the worship of God by the National Assembly in November, 1793. Thus the French Revolution took fearful revenge on the Revocation, and the Gallican Church was almost annihilated in France. The Pope himself was made prisoner by French troops, and his dominion changed into a republic (1798).

But this Reign of Terror was short-lived, and committed suicide. It brought France to the brink of ruin, from which it could be saved only by military despotism. The first Napoleon, the rider and tamer of the wild beast of Revolution, saw that society could not be reconstructed and maintained without religion. He therefore restored the Roman Catholic Church, and concluded a concordat with the Pope (1802). He also restored the legal existence of the Protestant (Calvinistic and Lutheran) Churches.

The Napoleonic system has, with unessential modifications and enlargements, remained in force through all the changes of government to this day. Even the Bourbons dared not set it aside, though they favored the Roman Church as far as possible. It is a system of limited liberty of religion under government supervision and with government support. It is an expansion of the Edict of Nantes with considerable improvements. It still recognizes the Roman Catholic Church as the religion of the great majority of Frenchmen, and gives her the strongest support; but it restores also the legal and ecclesiastical status of the Huguenot or Calvinistic Reformed Church, and removes the restrictions of the Edict of Nantes, by authorizing its public worship everywhere, in Paris as well as in the country. It recognizes and supports, in addition to those two Churches, the Lutheran Confession, and, since 1841, also the Jewish Synagogue; in Algiers, even the Mohammedan worship. Finally, it tolerates other religious societies and congregations, which support themselves (as the *Église libre*, founded in 1849, foreign churches of Episcopalians, Wesleyans, Baptists, the McAll missions, etc.). So far liberty is unrestrained in France, and nobody is persecuted simply for his religious opinions.

But by supporting the recognized religions from the public treasury, the civil government, whether imperial or monarchical or republican, keeps them under its control, and obstructs their free movement. Even the present republic does not allow the Reformed Church to exercise the right of

synodical self-government. It did so once, but once only, in 1872, under the Presidency of Thiers, and through the influence of Guizot. The synods held since that time are *unofficial*, and have no legislative authority. In this respect the present system is behind the Edict of Nantes, which authorized provincial and general synods. The anti-clerical infidel radicalism is opposed to the freedom and self-government of the Church, and endangers free institutions, which can only be maintained on the strong moral foundation of respect for law and reverence for religion.

As long as Church and State remain united in France, the majority of French Protestants avail themselves of the government patronage, hoping thereby to maintain a stronger social position and to exert a greater influence upon the people. But it is not impossible that the French government may abolish the Concordat, and put all Christian Churches on a footing of legal equality. Then they will be thrown on the duty of self-support and enjoy the full right of self-government. There can be no doubt that the Church of the Huguenots, which has stood the test of the severest persecution, will be abundantly able to take care of itself. Christianity needs and should ask nothing but freedom.

WAIFS AND STRAYS OF AMERICAN HISTORY.*

By Edward Wakefield.

No picture that the ablest historian can draw of the state of society at a past period in any country, is more vivid or trustworthy than that which is to be obtained from a file of old newspapers, if any such existed there at the time. Neither can anything give a truer view of the changes that have taken place in the ideas and habits of a people than a comparison of their public prints at different stages of their progress.

I was forcibly struck by this when staying recently at a farm-house in the Catskills, the proprietor of which, a hale and capable man of 81, is himself a relic of antiquity as it exists in America, and an encyclopædia of general knowledge of the early days. His father received a crown grant from George the Third, and was commissioner of lands for Ulster County at the Declaration of Independence and for many years afterwards. In his official capacity, the commissioner published notices of land sales in the *New York Packet*, then the recognized medium of such announcements, and kept a private copy of each paper. This file of old papers his son brought out of an ancient chest in the barn-loft, where they had lain for generations amongst a mass of obsolete documents, and kindly placed them at my disposal. They belong mostly to the latter part of the year 1789 and the beginning of 1790, and cover a most interesting and important period in the history of the Republic. The *Packet* of the 9th January, 1790, contains George Washington's speech to both Houses of Congress, dated "8th January, 1789," by mistake, the President, or his clerk, having evidently forgotten the new year and the printer having failed to correct the error.

The greater part of this speech is taken up by an earnest

---

* Read before the Huguenot Society, 19th December, 1889.

and well argued injunction to Congress to place the nation in an effective state of defence against both external and internal foes. "To be prepared for war," the President says, "is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace. A free people ought not only to be armed but disciplined." He then asked to be furnished with "a uniform and well-digested plan" of a military establishment; and, in connection with that subject, he makes a suggestion which contains the germ of the Protection policy, and which has since been employed with great success in support of that policy. "The safety and interest of the people," he says, "require that they should promote such manufactories as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly for military, supplies."

Only a few days ago, I met with a remarkable illustration of the employment of this argument for a purpose very different from that for which Washington intended it. There is at this moment sitting at Washington, a congress of the National Wool-Growers' Association, and in his opening address, the president of that body, the Hon. Columbus Delano, made the following remarks:

"Suppose the nation involved in a war, foreign or domestic, of serious dimensions, like that, for example, of the late rebellion; suppose our commerce embarrassed, as it was at that time; suppose our demand for wool no greater than it then was; and suppose that 'free trade' had destroyed the sheep industry and turned over to foreign nations the production of our wool—and we may be able to appreciate the folly, if not the crime, of attempting to put wool on the free list."

To this *Fibre and Fabric*, the chief organ of the woolen trade in the United State, wittily replies:

"Mr. Delano has, perhaps, never heard the story of Mrs. Muldoon, who complained to the mayor that her cellar was full of water and drowned her chickens. The mayor said: 'Mrs. Muldoon, why don't you keep ducks?'"

The satire is both obvious and just. It indicates the fallacy of a great nation permanently basing its fiscal policy upon the remote contingency of a disaster which has only occured once in a century and may never occur again. It needs

no reflection, indeed, to see that this argument, coming from the president of the Wool-Growers' Association in 1889, is merely a pretext for supporting duties which give that body a monopoly of the raw material of American woolen manufactures.

Very different was the signification of the same argument coming from George Washington in 1790. War with external or internal foes was then by no means a remote contingency. The young republic had only just emerged from the bitterest of all wars except religious wars, namely, a war of independence; and, though the so-called peace of 1783 had been maintained in a fashion for nearly seven years, it had proved little better than an armistice. The British King refused to receive a diplomatic representative from the people whom he still called, even in official papers, his "revolted subjects"; and, in plain violation of the treaty of 1783, British garrisons still occupied the frontier forts on the soil of the United States. Actual warfare, indeed, was yet being waged with the Indians, who were undoubtedly instigated and paid by the British government, in accordance with the atrocious policy of George the Third's infatuated ministers. Both nations, in fact, were merely taking a breathing space after a struggle which had exhausted one as much as the other. It was still quite uncertain whether peace would be finally established or whether hostilities would be renewed. The Americans were full of fight, and a very large party were dead against making peace with Great Britain on any terms that the King and his Cabinet would have been likely to listen to. It was not until four years later that John Jay, that excellent Huguenot but true American patriot, was able to negotiate a treaty which, whilst it secured peace on terms highly honorable to the United States, at the same time put the commerce of the two countries on a practicable footing. Even then, so sore were the American people against their former oppressor, and so jealous of their newly won independence, that the treaty was violently opposed and the legislature was only with the greatest difficulty prevailed on to ratify it. There was even a proposal, vigorously supported in some quarters, to impeach both Washington and John Jay

for consenting to such a treaty on behalf of the United States; and it is probable that formal steps would have been taken towards that object had not some of the cooler heads demonstrated the constitutional objection to an impeachment respecting a measure which was subject to the approval of congress.

It is necessary to bear in mind, in considering the state of public feeling in Great Britain and America at that time, that the French Revolution was in full progress and was exercising a powerful influence upon both countries, though a very different influence upon each. In Great Britain, the features of the Revolution which mainly affected the public mind were its evil features, its bloodshed, its terror, its disorder, its unbridled license, its unmeasured and irrational brutality, its diabolical purpose, as it seemed, to subvert the very foundations of society and to outrage all the laws of God and man. The British are by natural instinct, as well as by immemorial tradition, an essentially aristocratic people; and the excesses of the Revolution appeared to them to furnish nothing more than a shocking example of what might be expected from democracy.

In America, on the contrary, the ardor for popular liberty which had been engendered and maintained by the struggle for national independence, inspired the mass of the people with the warmest sympathy with what they regarded as a kindred uprising in France. To them, familiar with some of the horrors of internal strife, the excesses of the Reign of Terror seemed but natural incidents of the situation, for which, not the Revolution, but the tyranny which had preceded it, was responsible.

This sympathy in the triumph of the democratic principle was mutual. Lafayette's statue in New York commemorates for all time that celebrated saying of his: "As soon as I heard of American independence, my heart was enlisted"; and it was equally true that as soon as the Americans heard of the French Revolution, *their* heart was enlisted. Thus, that great convulsion, which more than any other single political event in modern times has influenced the destiny of nations individually and also the relations between one nation and another, had this effect for the time being upon the British and the Americans re-

spectively, standing as they were, at truce, but with their hand on the hilt of the sword, ready to draw it again at a moment's notice. It made it more difficult and more unpalatable for the British to recognize the rightness of the revolutionary cause in America; and at the same time it disinclined the Americans to justify their cause by moderation and a desire for peace after the original *casus belli* had ceased to exist.

Hence, Washington and all those great men who were most closely identified with his masterful and far-seeing statesmanship, while they earnestly wished for peace and were firmly resolved to employ all honorable and patriotic means to bring it about, nevertheless discerned the magnitude of the influences that were working in the opposite direction. At the begin- of 1790 they could not be at all certain that the United States would not be compelled to support a prolonged and embittered struggle, not only with Great Britain but with other anti-revolutionary European powers. Such a struggle at that time would literally have shut the United States in upon themselves and reduced them to terrible extremities if they had not been, as Washington advised them to make themselves, "independent of others for essential, particularly military supplies."

It was for this reason that the first domestic industry which received assistance from Congress was the manufacture of gunpowder; and throughout these papers we find frequent notices of the quantity of ammunition turned out by the various mills from week to week, with congratulatory anticipatious of the time when the nation would possess enough gunpowder of their own making to need none from foreign sources.

At this point it is fitting to note the attitude assumed at the period of which I am speaking by a very interesting and important section of the American people, namely, the Huguenots, to whose descendants and historians I have the privilege of addressing this paper. Driven from their own beloved country by the tyranny and faithlessness of a King of France, they were naturally in favor of a revolution which was the legitimate protest of their adopted country against the tyranny and faithlessness of a King of England. In their eyes, George

the Third was merely a blundering Louis Quatorze. But the moment liberty was achieved, the Huguenots were among the first to discern and boldly to declare the wisdom of establishing peace between two peoples of one race whom only the folly and wickedness of their rulers had parted. The honor of negotiating the first treaty between the United States and England which had any element of permanency belongs to the great and good John Jay, a Huguenot of the Huguenots; and after the discussions upon the treaty were over, and the wisdom of Jay's action had been acknowledged throughout the Republic, it was another Huguenot, Boudinot, who, as the chief executive officer of congress, signed the peace, in the name and by the authority of the supreme legislature of the United States. From that time until now the Huguenot citizens of America have ever been found active and devoted in the cause of peace and progress, warmly allied to the true principles of patriotism, whether popular or not for the moment, and holding up the bright and steadfast lamp of the country's good as a guide to the people above the tempest of passion or the murky atmosphere of selfish interests.

Having done with the subject of the national defences, the Father of his Country, in his first speech to congress, turns to another subject even dearer to his heart, namely, public education, and appeals to the councils of the nation in an eloquent passage which retains all its force at the present day. It ought to be inscribed in letters of gold on the walls of every parliament house in the world:

"There is nothing that can better deserve your patronage than the promotion of science and literature. Knowledge is, in every country, the surest basis of popular happiness. In one in which the measures of government receive their impression so immediately from the sense of the community, as in ours, it is proportionably essential. To the security of a free constitution, it contributes in various ways: by convincing those who are entrusted with the public administration that every valuable end of government is best answered by the enlightened confidence of the people, and by teaching the people themselves to know and value their own rights; to discern and provide against invasions of them; to distinguish between oppression and the

necessary exercise of lawful authority—between burthens proceeding from a disregard to their convenience, and those resulting from the invincible exigencies of society; to discriminate the spirit of liberty from that of licentiousness—cherishing the first, avoiding the last, and uniting a speedy but temperate vigilance against encroachments, with an inviolable respect to the laws."

It would be difficult to find a more pithy piece of composition in the English language, outside, perhaps, of "Bacon's Essays." Modern American politicians might find a good deal of food for reflection in it.

The *Packet*, of the 23rd of January, contains the report of Knox, the Secretary of War, which professed to furnish the "uniform and well digested plan" that Washington had asked for. Knox, however, had none of Washington's clearness of mind, or vigor of expression. His report is as verbose as the President's message is terse. It consists for the most part of a pompous dissertation on the superiority of the republican to the monarchical form of government, and on the evils of a standing army. "Princes and Ministers," says this pharisaical patriot, "seem neither to have leisure nor inclination to bring forward institutions for diffusing general strength, knowledge, and happiness; but they seem to understand the Mechivalian (*sic*) maxims of politics, *divide and govern*. May the United States avoid the errors and crimes of other governments, and possess the wisdom to embrace the present invaluable opportunity of establishing such institutions as shall invigorate, exalt, and perpetuate the great principles of freedom—an opportunity pregnant with the fate of millions, but rapidly borne on the wings of time, and may never return again." The Secretary of War gets rather mixed in his metaphors, and also rather loose in his grammar at this point. An opportunity pregnant with the fate of millions, but rapidly borne on the wings of time, is such a bewildering idea that it is gratifying to know it may never return again. The gist of Knox's plan is that the defence of the United States ought to rest on a volunteer militia, and not on a standing army; a principle which has been carried into effect with very good results.

This, of course, was what Washington meant when he said, "A free people ought to be not only armed, but disciplined."

The same number of the *Packet* reports the proceedings in the New York House of Assembly, on the 20th and 21st of January, 1790, when Mr. Clarkson brought in his bill "for the gradual abolition of slavery" in that state. The bill was read a first and second time without opposition, but on the motion for committal, Mr. Schoonmaker moved that it be rejected, and it was rejected by 29 votes against 27.

It has often been pointed out, as if it were a flaw in Washington's singularly perfect character as a statesman and political philosopher, that when he possessed almost unbounded influence over his fellow-countrymen, as it seemed, he failed to use it against an institution equally shocking to humanity and perilous to the commonwealth—an institution destined to shake to its foundations, seventy years later, the fabric which Washington spent his life in building up. This reflection upon the liberator's fame is thrown into startling prominence in this old newspaper. On one page, we find the congress voting enthusiastic replies to the President's speech so full of lofty sentiments regarding freedom, justice, and the rights of man. On the next, we find a humble effort to bring about the gradual abolition of slavery in the most enlightened state of the Union stamped out as if it were a mere visionary's fad or an agitator's cry. Everything was considered justifiable to gain and keep the liberty and the rights of the European inhabitants, intruders, though they were, on the domain of the Indians. The resort to arms was not only justifiable, but heroic. Yet the poor negroes were not to enjoy any share of liberty, or any rights at all. They were to groan in slavery for all time, and not even to be allowed a feeble hope of gradual enfranchisement. Washington could see that "knowledge, in every country, is the surest basis of public happiness." Yet he left untouched a system which made it a crime to teach a slave to read or write. He was very eloquent on the necessity for distinguishing between oppression and the exercise of lawful authority, for discriminating the spirit of liberty from that of licentiousness. Yet he had not a word to say against the

cruelest oppression that ever was perpetrated under the name of law, or the most shameless licentiousness that ever sullied a land of liberty. Well might it be contended that Clarkson, with his modest, ineffectual motion in the New York House of Assembly, was a truer patriot and a wiser statesman than Washington with his magnificent speech to the congress of the United States.

The student of history, however, knows that that contention would be ill-founded, because it would be founded on only a very partial view of the facts and circumstances. Paradoxical as it may seem, it is, nevertheless, true that it was no business of Washington's to abolish slavery, and that, if he had attempted it, he would have been unfaithful to his mission as an apostle of liberty. His business was to free the American colonies from the yoke of a power which would neither govern them aright nor allow them to govern themselves, and to knit them together under a sovereign government strong enough to hold its own against all comers. But the only way to achieve that end, to induce the several states to come in under the Union, was to confirm them in all their existing rights of local government and all their powers of dealing with domestic institutions, including slavery, the most important of all. It is not necessary, in Washington's case, to use the argument which has so often been used in excuse for oppressors, that he could not be expected to be in advance of his age; nor would that argument have much force in view of the enlightened action of Clarkson and his supporters. It is enough to show that Washington was absolutely debarred from interfering with slavery by the very terms of the Constitution under which he was striving, against heavy odds, to establish the freedom of his country.

This very newspaper, which contains what appears at a superficial glance to be a painful contrast between Washington and Clarkson, contains also the explanation of that seeming contrast. It furnishes abundant evidence that in January, 1790, the states were not yet by any means United States, and that any attempt to dominate them in domestic affairs would assuredly have frustrated the whole scheme of the Union. The

subject which at that time was exercising the public mind most of all, was the reluctance of the southern states to adopt the Constitution, owing to the fear that their internal affairs might be interfered with. Washington's main object was to allay that fear, and to induce them to believe that they would have everything to gain and nothing to lose by joining the Union. North Carolina had just reluctantly consented to come in, and, accordingly, we find the event celebrated by the following "Epigram" in the poet's corner of the *New York Packet* :—

Convinced of its folly, fatigu'd with its toil and
Afraid of being serv'd up as sauce for Rhode Island,
Carolina, the Northern, at length has agreed
To the New Constitution 'tis best to accede.
"These Yankees and Boobies must have their own head ;
"Since we can't lead the rascals, we e'en must be led."
So have I observed a collection of boys,
In pursuit of some scheme of their puerile joys,
Uniting to draw up the steep of a hill,
Some cart or some waggon of ponderous wheel ;
While tugging and straining to gain their career,
Some mischievous urchin has lurk'd in the rear,
Exerted his strength to defeat the design,
And pull'd ninety pounds back to his forwarding nine ;
Till, finding his efforts too weak for the tide,
He gives up his project and jumps on to ride.

It is not very brilliant as an epigram, but it describes the situation at that juncture better, perhaps, than if its wit had been more pointed and its verse more flowing. It should suffice to satisfy every one that, laudable and far-seeing as were the efforts of the abolitionists in the state legislature, Washington would have made a fatal mistake if he had taken part in the movement.

Next to the question of consolidating the Republic itself, the subject of the greatest public interest in New York a hundred years ago appears to have been taxation and a scheme of national credit. The difficulties of raising the necessary revenue for the purposes of the Federal government were very

great, and the difficulty of creating confidence in the solvency of that government was still greater. Hence we find a large proportion of the eight short columns of reading matter in the *Packet* devoted almost every Saturday—it was a weekly paper —to discussions on the two branches of the financial question, taxation and credit. In a really able article on the 19th January, 1790, it is contended that the revenue ought to be raised neither wholly by import duties nor wholly by excise, but partly by one method and partly by the other, lest by excessive import duties commerce should be discouraged, or by excessive excise duties, industry should be paralyzed. But in the same article, obstacles are pointed out, in the way of achieving this desirable adjustment of the public burthens, which have a curious historical interest, a flavor of the time, so to speak. Taxation by excise, the writer says, is both justifiable and expedient. But the system was odious in America from its association with British tyranny, the attempt to enforce excise laws having been the immediate cause of the revolt of the colonies. "For this reason, the name of excise ought not to enter a revenue system in the United States—for though our duties on inland trade and business shall be established on equitable principles, and with a most sacred regard to the rights of men and citizens, the ideas associated with that word will not be removed for half a century." We probably have here the origin of the term "internal revenue," which has been employed ever since in the United States for a system of taxation identical with the excise in Great Britain. The other obstacle pointed out by the *Packet*, that stood in the way of a proper national fiscal system, was the refusal of many of the states to abandon their own import and excise duties, notwithstanding that they had joined the Union. "That politicians of a little territory, pressed for expedients, should patronize them before the formation of a general government, is not so strange; but that any should persevere at the present crisis, is unfortunate. Everything of this kind is in its nature antinational, and leads to jealousy and contention between the states. It is contrary to the spirit of our Constitution, which wisely provides that commerce with all its interests, shall be

under the control of one nurturing parent, and it will give rise to counteracting schemes of revenue, which will for a time oppress the people, and in the end defeat the whole." It is remarkable that though a hundred years have passed since that was written, it is still as much as the most stringent Federal laws can do to prevent the states from pursuing, under one disguise or another, the "anti-national" course complained of by the *Packet*.

As for import duties, that excellent paper goes solid for protection of home manufactures, and heavy duties on luxuries. On the latter point it is very unctuous :—"An absolute prince may prohibit luxury and extravagance in dress by his positive injunctions, but the experiment will not succeed with a people who have such ideas of liberty as prevail in the United States. A more safe method is to discourage foreign superfluities, and encourage our own manufactures by duties judiciously imposed. It is better to enrich our revenue at the expense of prodigality than of industry. The prodigal are self devoted to ruin, and as the event cannot be prevented, for the contagion of their example let them make the only possible atonement, a contribution to the necessities of the country which hath protected them."

The discussions upon the public credit which appear in both the editorial and the correspondence columns of these old papers are quite bewildering to a reader at the present time, unless he takes into account the total ignorance of that important branch of politics which then prevailed even in the most enlightened and best governed countries. In America the first glimmerings of light upon it had not yet appeared, but the practice was for the government to borrow wherever they could, and on whatever terms they could, at each emergency, on Treasury certificates, and to trust in Providence to enable them to pay the interest some day or other. Thus we find Joseph Nourse, Register of the Debt, advertising on the 5th of January, 1790, that "Some misapprehension having arisen relative to the payment of interest on certificates issued from this office, notice is hereby given that indents for interest will be paid as usual on the registered debt to the 31st December,

1787, and that new certificates continue to issue from this office," etc., etc. This simply meant that a panic had occurred and the government were endeavoring to restore confidence by borrowing more money to pay interest with. The most reasonable efforts at reform were so misunderstood and aroused so much opposition that it is easy to realize the perplexities of the officials. One of the chief causes of the financial difficulty was manifestly the high rate of interest, namely, six per cent. Yet, when Hamilton, the Secretary of the Treasury, proposed a rude scheme of conversion by which the rate was to be reduced to four per cent., he was met by a storm of resentment and misrepresentation. A writer in the *Packet* of the 27th February, 1790, says:—"Should this be the case, there can be no future dependence. Next year they may reduce it to two per cent. and the year following they may, by the same unjustifiable measure, make a *bonfire* of the principal, together with the public *honour and credit* of the United States." This appears to have been a pretty faithful reflection of public opinion! What complicated matters most of all, however, was that each state had its own debt or debts, at various rates of interest, and that many of the states were insolvent. Some of them, indeed, had deliberately repudiated their debts in order to compel the general government to take them over, and though the government had a nominal power of taxing a "delinquent" State for payment of interest on its debt, they did not yet feel strong enough to use it. The *Packet*, in fact, while severely reproaching the delinquent states for their dishonesty, and also for their want of patriotism in destroying the public credit, strongly recommends that almost any device should be resorted to in preference to coercion, which might actually imperil the Union itself.

The more we study the situation, thus truthfully exhibited in these blunt, outspoken old prints, and the more we reflect on the thousand and one difficulties of dealing with it, the more we must admire the talents, the patience and the energy of the statesmen and administrators who evolved order out of such chaos and built up a temple of freedom and prosperity out of such materials.

The foreign intelligence in these old *Packets* is very full and very interesting, though just two months after date. It covers a most momentous period in European history, including the very crisis of the French Revolution and the siege of Belgrade, which was the beginning of the end of the Turkish Empire in Europe. It is rather surprising to find that the *Packet*, which may be taken to represent the feeling of the thinking class in America at that time, had no sympathy with the revolutionary party in France. On the contrary, it approves of martial law as "the most humane mode of restoring order," and confidently predicts that the king, Louis XVI., will speedily be restored to power. "A nation without laws," it says, "without security, without an army, without treasure, and without a king, cannot long subsist. The Marquis de Lafayette himself begins to be satisfied that the executive power had better be placed anywhere than in the mob. This march to Versailles has sickened him of his masters." The same writer makes another very bad shot with reference to the conquest of Corsica, then recently achieved by the French. "The expedition," he says, "cost France 10,725 men, besides the recovered wounded, and eighteen millions of livres in money. Yet the possession of Corsica has ever seemed as imperfect on the side of France as it did on that of Genoa. In short, the French, whose dominion over Corsica, if not at this moment actually annihilated, will in all human probability be of short duration, have gained as little advantage by the acquisition of the island as they did honour in the manner of obtaining it." To counterbalance these two blunders, however, he makes a prediction concerning Eastern affairs which reads now like an inspired prophecy:

"If the united arms of Russia and Austria shall continue to make an impression on the Turkish territories, they will dearly purchase every step of their advancement, so long as the Mussulmen shall be able to present so intrepid a front to their enemies. But when this ceases to be the case, if ever it should cease, when the Turks shall begin to flee like sheep before the devouring wolves, then, for certain, the other Powers of Europe, the Germans, the Poles, the French, the Venetians, and even the British nation will stand up in defence of

the Crescent and of political independence. So that the wisdom of Joseph and Catherine, even when they lay their heads together, amounts to no more than this, that they will batter the Turks so long as the Turks are able to batter them in their turn ; and that, after this, if they will fight, they must fight all the rest of Europe."

A clearer forecast of the Crimean War, the Treaty of Berlin, and the European situation at this very moment, could hardly be imagined. It is all the more singular from the fact that in 1789, when this was written, the interests in the East which brought the Western nations to the defence of Turkey, had scarcely begun to come into existence.

Scattered throughout these papers there are all sorts of suggestive, entertaining and instructive items regarding the social condition of the people and the state of the country. The price of food appears to have been extraordinarily high. On the 12th of February, 1790, an assize of bread was established, by which prices were fixed as follows:

"A loaf of inspected superfine wheat flour, to weigh 1 lb. 10 oz. for sixpence.

"A loaf of inspected common wheat flour, to weigh 1 lb. 11½ oz., for sixpence.

"A loaf of rye flour, to weigh 1 lb. 8 oz., for threepence."

The following "Price Current at Brandywine Mills, Jan. 2, 1790," is almost incredible now-a-days:

Wheat, 7s. 6d. to 8s. ($1.87 to $2).
Superfine flour, 42s. 6d. to 44s.
Common flour, 35s. to 38s.
Shipstuff, per cwt., 10s. 6d. to 11s.
Indian corn, 3s. to 3s. 6d.

This is all the more puzzling because the land was enormously productive. For example, here is an item from Philadelphia, dated 6th January, 1790:

"The following is the produce of 35 acres of ground, 14 acres of which is ploughed ground, farmed by William Johnson, of Frankford Mill: 170½ bushels barley, 139 rye, 56 wheat, 256½ buckwheat, 180 Indian corn, 50 tons hay, 20 tons pumpkins, 250 bushels potatoes, 100 bushels turnips, and ½ acre flax."

The high price of food is probably to be accounted for by the great difficulties of carriage in a country with few roads and little-known waterways, and the great cost of all the mechanical processes.

The *Packet* of the 6th March, 1790, contains an advertisement of "a valuable grist mill" for sale, with fifteen acres of orchard and meadow, and "a quantity of marsh useful for repairing the dam when wanting," "situated in the township of Brooklyn, in Kings county, about five miles water carriage to New York, and two and one-half miles by land to Brooklyn ferry. A loaded sloop can sail up to the mill door at most seasons of the year." The site of this mill is now in the middle of the city near the Navy Yard.

In the same paper we find the announcement of "An easy conveyance to Philadelphia by the new erected United States mail diligence." The diligence ran five days a week, and carried seven passengers only, at four dollars each; but there was an inferior sort of conveyance which carried an unlimited number of passengers at three dollars and a half. There is a picture of the "new erected United States mail diligence," which looks exactly like a modern hearse. There is also a picture of the "valuable grist mill in the township of Brooklyn." It recalls nothing so much as the palatial edifices which the children draw, and under which they write "this is a hous."

Advertisers in those days had a habit of giving instructions which would be rather "a biggish order" now, in this wise:

> "The printers of newspapers throughout the United States and in other parts of the continent of America, in the West Indies and in Europe are requested to insert the above."

This is at the foot of a half-column advertisement of the "Philadelphia Magazine and Universal Asylum," a monthly review projected under most promising auspices in January, 1790; and a similar notification appears at the foot of all the government advertisements and many others. Either the newspapers must have been very few, or the advertising rates must have been very low.

The advertising columns of the *Packet*, indeed, have not

at all a healthy look. They are largely occupied by flagrant puffs of quack medicines and cure-alls, prospectuses of books to be published by subscription, and official notices under the bankruptcy law, then recently adopted by the state of New York. If these and the government advertisements were taken away, there would be very few left. Among those few, the most interesting is an advertisement by George Washington for a coachman and a cook, both of whom are required to bring "indubitable testimonials of sobriety, honesty, good dispositions and attention to the duties of the station." It is worth noting, by the by, that at that time the colored people, as they are now called, were not at all sensitive on the point of complexion. There are several advertisements of servants wanting places, who describe themselves simply as "a black man" or "a black woman."

A glance through the miscellaneous items of intelligence shows that they had snake stories a hundred years ago. The *Packet* of the 27th February, 1790, contains a thrilling account of a conflict with a formidable reptile which measured thirty-two and a half feet long, and had three rows of teeth. "It is of the species called buffalo snakes," the writer says, "from their attacking and killing the buffalo by the following means: They spring upon the buffalo and continue twisting themselves by degrees round its body that in a couple of days the buffalo becomes, as it were, screwed up so tight that he dies, and falls an easy prey to the snake." This is decidedly what Theodore Hook used to call "one of Ben Trovato's." Amongst other sensational paragraphs, we read of a mad wolf in Franklin County, which, "having bit a number of sheep, hogs, dogs and horned cattle, did not stop there, but attacked a negro man, and bit a widow woman named Taggart in several places on the hips." It is satisfactory to learn that after "an engagement" between the wolf and a courageous weaver, in which the combatants struggled for a long time on the ground, "Mr. Carrel came to the weaver's assistance with an axe, and put an end to the monster." Kentucky appears to have been almost as lively a place then as it is now. We read in the *Packet* of the 13th January, 1790:—"Some travellers

from Kentucky report that as they passed through the wilderness about the 23rd of last month, they counted fourteen human bodies lying dead at no great distance from each other. Our informers also said that these unfortunate persons were all scalped (doubtless by the savages)—but that such was their hurry, to avoid a similar fate, they did not stop to enter into a very minute examination of them." If "travellers" were to come across such a find in Kentucky nowadays, they would merely conclude that the Howard party had passed that way, and been having a little difference with the Turner family.

These papers let in an amusing light on the customs and sentiments of American society in those old times. A good deal of space is occupied in a discussion on the propriety, or the reverse, of card-playing. There seems to have been a consensus of opinion that playing cards for money was altogether inadmissible among respectable people, while some correspondents decry card-playing even "for love," as a most dangerous and immoral practice. Others, however, support a round game, or even "a good game of whist," without money stakes, as a harmless amusement, and one bold writer takes up nearly half a column in contending that cards serve a very useful purpose by preventing gossipping, "which, of all other entertainments, certainly is the most destructive to society." Either gossip and slander were more rife in New York then than they are now, or else their effects were more noticeable, the community being smaller. There are numerous references to the subject in the editorial as well as the correspondence columns of these papers, a whole article, on one occasion, being devoted to a severe reprobation of "the diabolical act of taking away a good name," which is declared to be the mark of "decayed bachelors, splenatic old maids, and doubtful characters."

Nothing, however, raised the editorial dander so decidedly as the practice which, it appears, then prevailed in America, of "not only imitating very closely, but carrying to the greatest excess, too many of the absurd customs and fashions of Europe." "While our country at large," this stern *censor morum* proceeds, "is nobly disentangling herself from former prejudices, and endeavoring to form a character of her own—

while simple, reasonable and practical institutions are springing up in various parts of the Union, which tend to *nationalize* the people of these states, *Fashion* still connects us with the *house of bondage* by a chain that appears extremely hard to be broken."

Even this was not the worst. The article goes on:—"But this is an evil of very inferior concern, compared to imitations of their modes of speech and plans of education. In the principal towns of this continent, the English language is spoken by the undebauched natives with a purity unrivalled—and if our own pronounciation can be preserved in its original excellence, it will draw a line of distinction between us and foreigners, especially the modern Britons, who are making rapid strides towards a pronounciation which will ere long give them a language to be understood only by themselves. It is, therefore, to be wished that the capricious alterations, the grating, hissing, scratching sounds of novel reformers, may not obtain among us."

When this was written, Doctor Johnson had just finished his labors for purifying and fixing the English language, and Chesterfield, Gibbon, Burke, Sheridan, Chatham, Pitt, Fox and a host of other writers and orators had elevated it to a height of perfection which was never excelled before or since. What would the worthy editor of the *New York Packet* think, if he could wake up from his grave in Trinity Churchyard, and hear the American-English of the present day, which seems to consist of an *omnium gatherum* of all the cant phrases of all the nations upon earth!

These loose ends of American history, these waifs and strays, as I have called them, may seem disconnected and of little serious purpose. Yet they will not be altogether without profit if they enable us to study the marvellous past of this great country from a nearer and more familiar point of view, and thereby to correct and elevate our view of its present and its future. To me, the task of bringing them together in this form has been a labor of love. It has afforded me an occasion of again reviewing that astounding chain of events which bind America to the modern world. In following those events, I

see again the sublime Genoese zigzagging the unknown Atlantic in his god-like quest; the faithful Huguenots flying from Rochelle, their own Rochelle, fair city of the waters; the stern and fearless Puritans, leaving all they loved save their God, to seek civil and religious liberty in the far-off West. Above all, I am better able to appreciate the spirit of those noble lines in which the Poet Laureate has expressed the feelings of all right-minded Englishmen under the title of "England and America in 1782":—

O thou that sendest out the man
To rule by land and sea,
Strong mother of a lion line,
Be proud of those strong sons of thine
Who wrench'd their rights from thee.

What wonder, if in noble heat,
Those men thine arms withstood,
Retaught the lesson thou hadst taught,
And in thy spirit with thee fought—
Who sprang from English blood!

But thou rejoice with liberal joy,
Lift up thy rocky face,
And shatter, when the storms are black,
In many a streaming torrent back,
The seas that shock thy base!

Whatever harmonies of law
The growing world assume,
Thy work is thine—The single note
From that deep chord which Hampden smote,
Will vibrate to the doom.

THE BAYARD FAMILY OF AMERICA, AND JUDGE BAYARD'S LONDON DIARY OF 1795-96.*

By Gen. Jas. Grant Wilson.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: After reading, a few days ago, the Proceedings of this Society during the past six years, it seemed to your speaker, in view of the weighty words of wit and wisdom therein contained in praise of the Huguenots and their descendants, and of the many and manifold graces and lofty traits which characterized them, that not having been born of that highly favored race rendered his life a failure, and, indeed, hardly worth living. However, he takes some comfort in the thought that if not a Huguenot, he is so closely connected with one who is an associate of this Society, that there is possibly some hope for him, as Doctor Samuel Johnson said that there was for a Scotchman, if he was caught young enough! The speaker's wife, he is happy to announce, comes from a long line of Huguenot ancestors, traceable for precisely three hundred years, and she is among the representatives of the eldest branch of that distinguished family of which he is to have the honor of addressing you this evening.

Among the hundred thousand Huguenot fugitives driven from the fair fields of France by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and by the bitter religious persecutions which preceded that barbarous Jesuit edict of October 25th, 1685, were many who fled, as the Pilgrim Fathers had done, to Holland: others sought refuge in the New World. Their descendants were such men as John Bayard, Elias Boudinot, James Bowdoin, Peter Faneuil, Bishops Provoost and De Lancey, and, greatest of them all, Chief-Justice Jay, whose reputation as a sincere patriot was second only to that of Washington, and of whom

* Read before the Huguenot Society, April 17th, 1890.

Webster beautifully said, "When the spotless ermine of the judicial robe fell on John Jay, it touched nothing less spotless than itself." The expatriated French Huguenots were heroes of the highest type, and worthy peers of that noble band of English Pilgrims who landed on Plymouth Rock more than two and a half centuries ago. The intermarriage of these two races has given to our country some of her noblest citizens. To mention a single instance, I would name my venerable friend Robert C. Winthrop, an honored Vice-President for Massachusetts of this Society.

For more than two centuries the belief has prevailed among the Bayards of America that they are descended from the famous French family of Dauphiné which gave to the world one of the most beautiful characters mentioned in modern history. This is, however, merely a pleasing tradition of which thus far we have no documentary proof. Of Samuel Bayard, who married Anna Stuyvesant, little was known until last summer, beyond the fact that he was a wealthy merchant of Amsterdam who died prior to the spring of 1647, when his widow with her three sons and a daughter came to this country in company with her brother Peter Stuyvesant. The Governor had previously married Judith, the sister of Samuel Bayard, so that they were doubly brothers-in-law. While traveling in Holland in 1875, I made efforts to trace the ancestors of the Amsterdam merchant, but they were attended with the same lack of success which had met many similar efforts made by members of the family, and chiefly by Richard Henry Bayard, American Minister to Belgium during the administration of Millard Fillmore. In July last, being again in Holland, I resumed my quest. It affords me very great pleasure to announce that my efforts were at length attended with partial success. We now know something more of Samuel Bayard and who two generations of his ancestors were, so that we at present possess the family genealogy for precisely three hundred years, a highly respectable antiquity for the New World if not for the Old, where I was lately the guest of a nobleman whose ancestors had lived on the same spot for a thousand years! Lord Tollemache occupies an ancient castle surrounded

by a double moat, the drawbridges are raised every night precisely as they were in the days of Richard the Lion-hearted, and when I asked him if his ancestor came over with William the Conqueror, the proud old patrician of four-score contemptuously replied, "No, my family were here a hundred years before the Norman bastard was born!"

The father of Samuel Bayard was the Reverend Lazare Bayard, a Huguenot clergyman of distinction, who in 1607 married Judith Beyens, of a noble Belgian family originally from North Brabant. His first church was at Breda, where his eldest child, Judith, and his eldest son, Samuel, were born. The family consisted of eight children. The father of Lazare was Nicholas, an eminent Huguenot professor and doctor of divinity in charge of the French church at Antwerp for several years prior to 1590. As the massacre of St. Bartholomew, which drove the Protestants from France, took place in 1572, there are less than two decades to be accounted for. These may have been spent in Antwerp by Doctor Bayard, who is doubtless the divine from whom the family tradition has always been that the American Bayards were descended. The additional tradition that he married Blandina Condé, a titled lady belonging to the illustrious French family of that name, has not yet been verified. A search is now being made by an accomplished Amsterdam genealogist to trace the early history of Nicholas Bayard and his immediate family, and so to settle the long uncertainty as to the province of France to which they belonged.

Colonel Martin Bayard, of Ghent, who was second to no young soldier of his day in deeds of chivalric daring, is believed to have been a brother of Nicholas, and is known to have been a Huguenot and a native of France. With his Walloon troopers he thundered upon the enemy, like the brilliant chevalier, visor down and lance in rest:

"They quitted not their harness bright,
Neither by day, nor yet by night:
They lay down to rest,
With corselet laced,

Pillowed on buckler cold and hard :
They carved at the meal
With gloves of steel,
And they drank the red wine through the helmet barred."

Samuel Bayard was born in Breda and baptized in the Walloon church, December 8th, 1610. He received a college education, and became an opulent merchant of Amsterdam, where he married, October 21st, 1638, Anna Stuyvesant, daughter of the Reverend Balthazar Stuyvesant, of Friesland, and his first wife, Margaret Hardenstein. Mrs. or Madame Bayard, as she was usually called, was a lady of imposing presence, highly educated, with great business capacity, and possessing a fair share of that imperious temper which characterized her brother, "hard-headed Peter." Samuel Bayard's country-house was at Alphen, a small town some seven miles distant from Leyden, where their children were born. The painter's art has preserved on canvas a view of the spacious residence and attractive grounds, also portraits of the six members of the family as they appeared about 1640. Bayard died six years later. Early in 1647 his widow,* with her four children and their tutor, sailed from Amsterdam with Director-General Stuyvesant on board the *Princess*, accompanied by the *Great Gerrit*, the *Zwol*, and the *Raet*. William Beekman, the progenitor of the New York family of that name, was also a passenger on the *Princess*, which arrived in this city May 11th, 1647.

Madame Bayard, her daughter Catherine, and her sons—Peter, named in honor of his uncle; Balthazar, after his maternal grandfather; and Nicholas, after his great grandfather—being the ancestors of the American Bayards, a family which has filled an important place in the annals of the American army and navy, in commerce and in Church and State. Four of the Bayards occupied seats in the United States Senate

* Among the few Holland heirlooms brought to this country by Madame Bayard which have survived the flood of years, is a piece of valuable lace more than three centuries old, now in the possession of Mrs. J. G. Wilson, of New York. It was frequently worn by her great-grandmother, Mrs. John Bayard, at President and Mrs. Washington's dinner-parties and receptions in Philadelphia, Pa.

almost continuously for nearly four-score years,* one was among the signers of the Treaty of Ghent, and another who is an honored member of this Society, was Secretary of State during the late administration of Grover Cleveland.† The Bayards have in the course of two centuries intermarried with the Washingtons and Fairfaxes of Virginia; the Bassetts, Carrolls, Howards and Wirts of Maryland; the Francis and Willing families of Pennsylvania; the Kembles, Kirkpatricks, Stevenses and Stocktons of New Jersey; the Beekmans,

---

* The nearest approach to the Bayard record made by any other American family is in the case of the Adamses, John having sat in the Senate Chamber as Vice-President from 1789 to 1797, while his son, John Quincy, was a Senator from 1803 to 1808 and a Representative from 1831 to 1848, and his grandson, Charles Francis, was a Representative from 1859 to 1861. Quite as remarkable as these instances of succession is the case of the Dodge family, which furnishes the only illustration in our history of a father and son sitting side by side in the Senate for years. Henry C. Dodge was elected one of the first Senators from Wisconsin upon her admission to the Union, and served from 1848 to 1857, while his son, Augustus C., was elected in the very same year one of the first Senators from the adjoining State of Iowa upon her admission, and the two were colleagues for nearly seven years, when, in 1855, the son resigned his seat to go as Minister to Spain. Very notable, too, is the case of the famous Washburn family, the surviving brothers of which recently presented a public library to the town of Livermore, Me., where they were born. Four members of the same generation have been elected Representatives in the House—Israel from Maine, Elihu B. from Illinois, Cadwalader C. from Wisconsin, and William D. from Minnesota—and the three first-named were colleagues during the 34th, 35th, and 36th Congresses. To General James Shields, a native of Ireland, belongs the unique distinction of having at different times represented three States in the Senate. In 1849 he was elected for a full term from Illinois; in 1857 he was chosen one of the first Senators from Minnesota and served about a year, and in the winter of 1879 he returned to the body for a few weeks to fill an unexpired term from Missouri.

† Ex-Secretary Thomas Francis Bayard, who is connected with that dead and gone worthy, Sir Philip Francis, the author of "Junius," has in his possession a letter addressed by Sir Philip Francis to his American kinsman Colonel Turbott Francis, the Secretary's great grand-uncle. The Englishman writes to the Philadelphia Colonel concerning some property in Maryland. "I am determined to keep a little freehold in America," he says. "At present I am bound to the Ganges, but who knows whether I may not end my days on the banks of the Ohio? It gives me great comfort to reflect that I have relatives who are honest fellows in almost every part of the world. In America the name of Francis flourishes. I don't like to think of the quantity of salt water between us. If it were good claret, I would drink my way to America."

Cuttings, De Lanceys, Jays, Livingstons, Pintards, Schuylers, Stuyvesants, Verplancks, Van Cortlandts and Van Rensselaers of New York; and the Bowdoins and Winthrops of Massachusetts.

Peter Bayard married Blandina Kierstadt, daughter of Dr. Hans Kierstadt and Sarah Roelofs and granddaughter of Jans Roelofs and his wife, the celebrated heiress Anneke Jans. They resided on the northeast corner of Broadway and Exchange Place.* (I may perhaps be permitted to mention in

---

* Among other houses owned by Peter Bayard was the one described in the following well-preserved parchment, in Dutch, dated August, 1656. It is among the many Bayard documents in the speaker's possession.

We, the undersigned, Councilmen of the City of Amsterdam, in New Netherland, declare hereby that before us compared and appeared, Adam Brouwer, now residing on the Lower Inland, who declared to transfer and convey to and in favor of Dirck Van Schelluyne, Notary Public and Gatekeeper of this City, a certain house and lot, situated within this said City, north of the commenced canal between the lots of Jan de Kuyper [John the Cooper] on the west side and Egl. Woutersze [Walter's son] on the east side, wide, fronting the street, with free access on both sides, in Rhinelandish rods, four feet and six inches, from there eastward along the line of the lot of Henry Jochemse, in a straight line to the rear of the garden, six rods, nine feet, from there eastward to the fence and line of Egl. Woutersze three rods, six feet and two inches, following the same line to the north, seven rods and one foot. from there westward following the line of the lot of Dirck Bousich to the lots of Gerrit de Molenaar [Garrett the Miller] there and where the servant of Jacob de Brouwer [the Brewer] has been building, three rods, six inches, along the same lot southward, four rods, three feet, along the lot of said Gerrit de Molenaar, again westward, one rod, seven feet, and so keeping on along the line of the lots of Gerrit and Abram de Molenaar to the rear of the lot of Jan de Kuyper, again to the south five rods, five feet and four inches, from there once more in a line running eastward, one rod, two feet and eight inches, and from there again till reaching the street southward, five rods, six feet and one inch, according to the measurement made by the Court-messenger in presence of Egl. Woutersze and John de Kuyper, which happened on the 18th of August of this year. And this by force of letter patent given to the Comparant by us Councilmen and in date February 7th, 1647, which foresaid house and lot, as said before, as the same is as to the carpenter work, the trees etc., he, the Comparant is transferring and conveying as a true and rightful property, to the aforenamed Dirck Van Schelluyne, with all such actions, rights and rightfulness as he has administered and possessed the same, Renouncing therefore any further action, right or pretension of property which by him Comparant or anybody in his behalf might be made on foresaid house and lot, with promise to hold the same safe against any claim or encumbrance brought forward by any one in the world

passing that if any one in this audience is ambitious of becoming part owner of the Trinity Church property my wife, who is one of the heirs of Anneke Jans, would be willing to negotiate for the sale of her interest in the estate on exceedingly moderate terms.) Balthazar married Judith Loockermans, a great heiress, and resided next door to Peter; Nicholas married Judith Varleth, and lived in the High Street; their sister Madame de Meyert's home was in Smith's Valley, near the present Centre Street, and their aunt, the widow Stuyvesant, resided on the Bouwerie road beyond the Fresh Water. These statements refer to the year 1690 or precisely two centuries ago. The descendants in the male line of Balthazar and Nicholas are, I believe, extinct, while those of the elder brother,* known as the Delaware Bayards, are numerous. One

---

(excepting however his rights as master), all for the agreed upon price according to contract, to be paid and settled in full, declaring furthermore to consider this his transfer and conveyance as firmly binding and unbreakable, to live up to it and perform it, in connection with and submission to all rights and documents, the minute of this has been subscribed to by Councilmen Jacob Strijcker and Hendrich Kip in a protocol at the Secretary's office of this City, this the 19th of August, 1656.

and have affixed here the city's seal and sealed it herewith.

Is in accord with the forenamed protocol

JACOB KIP,

Secretary.

* A large and heavy folio Bible printed in Dordrecht in 1690 is now in the possession of his descendant, Mrs. James Grant Wilson, of New York. The title-page to the Old Testament is missing, but the massive volume is otherwise perfect, and in the original binding, with strong brass clasps and ornamental corner-pieces. It is enriched with maps and illustrated with curious copperplate engravings. The record is written in Dutch, of which the following is a translation:

1. My father, Petrus Bayard, died in New York, in the year 1699.
2. My honored mother, Blandina, died in New York in the year 1702.
3. Samuel Bayard, eldest son of Petrus Bayard, was born in the year 1675.
4. His wife Susanna Bouchelle was born in the year 1677.
5. Our daughter, Anna Maria, died Jan. 12, 1716.
6. My late honored husband, Samuel Bayard, died on Thursday evening, Nov. 23, 1721, at ten o'clock, and rested in the Lord, where he forever reaps in joy what he hath here sown in sorrow. Amen.
7. My honored mother, Anna Margarita Condé, died on Saturday morning, Dec. 29, 1721, at nine o'clock and blessed, rests forever in the Lord Jesus Christ.
8. My honored brother, Hendrick Sluyter, died on Sunday evening, Feb. 4,

of these, the great-great-grandson of Peter, is the principal subject of the remaining portion of this paper.*

An ancient manuscript diary kept in London almost a century ago by Judge Bayard, of New Jersey, and which by some incredible piece of good luck has survived the inroads of housemaids, rats, and book-worms for ninety-four years, has recently come into my possession. This antique literary treasure consists of some two hundred quarto pages of thick yellow-tinted paper, embrowned with age and dust to the shade of a well-colored meerschaum. Before presenting extracts from Bayard's Journal I may be permitted to give a brief biography of the diarist, who was sent by Washington to Great Britain, after the ratification of the Jay treaty, to prosecute the claims of American citizens. He was thus employed for a period of about four years. His Journal, which has been preserved and is marked Number one, covers the period from Friday, May 8th, 1795, to December 31st, 1796, inclusive. From it and from other sources, we learn that the young American was well acquainted with William Wilberforce; with Edmund Burke, and Colonel Barré, who lost an eye in the battle in which

---

1722, at eight o'clock. And has entered forever into the rest of the Lord, whom now he shall with all his saints, unceasingly thank, honor and praise to all eternity. Amen.

9. My honored uncle Jacobus Sluyter, died on Friday, April 14, 1714, at three o'clock in the afternoon, and happy rested in the Lord, after having fought the good fight. Thus he received the reward of a faithful servant for which he now gives God praise, honor, and glory, and shall to all eternity. Amen.

* 1590–1890.

1. Reverend Nicholas Bayard, D.D.
2. Rev. Lazare Bayard, D.D. — Judith Beyens.
3. Samuel Bayard. — Anna Stuyvesant.
4. Peter Bayard. — Blandina Kierstadt.
5. Samuel Bayard. — Susanna Bouchelle.
6. James Bayard. — Mary Asheton.
7. John Bayard. — Margaret Hodge.
8. Samuel Bayard. — Martha Pintard.
9. Their only surviving child, Mrs. Caroline B. Dod, is the mother of
10. Mrs. Martha Bayard Stevens, of Castle Point, who, by her marriage, became possessed of the Hoboken estate which belonged to her kinsman, William Bayard, a loyalist. It was purchased, under the act of confiscation, by Captain John Stevens, the father of the late Com. Edwin A. Stevens.

his friend Wolfe was killed, and who was always inflexibly opposed to the war with America; with the illustrious brothers Lords Eldon and Stowell and Lord Mansfield; with Cornwallis, Sir Henry Clinton, and Colonel Tarleton, who conversed with Bayard about their American campaigns; with William Godwin, Dr. John Wolcott, better known as "Peter Pindar," and other London *littérateurs* of that time; that he saw the great Admiral Lord Nelson, and that he frequently listened to the brilliant Erskine and Sheridan, and to the famous antagonists Fox and Pitt who, irreconcilable in life, are not divided in death. As Sir Walter says:

> "The mighty chiefs sleep side by side.
> Drop upon Fox's grave the tear,
> 'Twill trickle to his rival's bier."

Samuel Bayard was born in Philadelphia, January 11th, 1767. He was the fourth son of Colonel John Bayard, "a patriot of singular purity of character and disinterestedness, personally brave, pensive, earnest and devout," * who fought by the side of Washington in the battle of Princeton, and who was also in the engagements at Brandywine and Germantown. Young Bayard was graduated at Princeton College in 1784, delivering the valedictory oration, and he dined on that day with President Witherspoon and a distinguished company. He studied law with William Bradford, afterwards Attorney-General of the United States, and for seven years practiced law in Philadelphia. For three years he was in partnership with Mr. Bradford. In August, 1790, Samuel Bayard married Martha, daughter of Lewis Pintard, of New Rochelle, also of Huguenot descent, whose wife Susan was a sister of Richard Stockton, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence from New Jersey. In the following year Mr. Bayard was appointed clerk of the Supreme Court, being then but twenty-six years of age. After the ratification of the treaty with Great Britain negotiated by John Jay, he was nominated by Washington an agent of the United States to prosecute in the English

* *History of the United States*, by George Bancroft, vol. 5, p. 264, Centenary Edition. Boston, 1876.

Admiralty Courts the claims of American citizens, in accordance with the terms of that treaty dated November 19th, 1794.

During Samuel Bayard's residence in London two children were born and died, and were buried in Bunhill Fields, near the grave of Dr. Isaac Watts, of whose character and writings he was an enthusiastic admirer. Returning to his native land in 1798, Bayard spent several years at New Rochelle. While residing there he was appointed, by Governor Jay, Presiding Judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Westchester. In 1803 he removed to New York City and resumed the practice of the law. In the following year he with others founded the New York Historical Society, his associates, who were present at the first regular meeting held November 20th, 1804, in the old City Hall, being De Witt Clinton, Egbert Benson, Reverend John M. Mason, Reverend Samuel Miller, Reverend William Linn, Reverend John N. Abeel, John Pintard, Dr. David Hosack, Anthony Bleecker, and Peter G. Stuyvesant. "The minutes of our first meeting," says Dr. Francis, "notice the attendance of Samuel Bayard. He was connected by marriage with the family of the founder, John Pintard,* and they were most intimate friends. He was a gentleman of the old school, a scholar, a jurist, a trustee of Princeton College, a public-spirited man, and a hearty co-operator in establishing this association; widely acquainted with historical occurrences, and on terms of personal com-

---

*John Pintard, LL.D., 1759–1844, who was born and died in New York City, was the nephew and adopted son of Lewis Pintard, Commissary for American Prisoners in New York. Washington, in a letter to the British Commander-in-Chief, says:

HEADQUARTERS—MORRISTOWN Jan. 20 1777.

SIR—I take the liberty to propose the establishment of an officer to reside in New York, under parole to transmit no intelligence but what belongs to his office —whose business it shall be to provide such necessaries for such prisoners as fall into your hands. Perhaps the establishment of such an officer with proper credit, may put a stop to the many complaints which I am daily under the necessity of hearing, some of them probably without foundation and others from the want of many things you are not obliged to furnish the prisoners. The gentleman whom I would beg leave to recommend as a proper agent is Mr. Lewis Pintard, the bearer, a person well known in New York and of long established reputation as a considerable merchant.

munication with many of the active men of the Revolution, including Governor Livingston of New Jersey. We are indebted to Mr. Bayard for that remarkable series of MSS., the Journals of the House of Commons during the Protectorate of Cromwell, which fills so important a niche in the library of the New York Historical Society."*

In 1806 Samuel Bayard purchased property at Princeton and removed with his family to that pleasant collegiate town, which continued to be his place of residence for nearly two-score years. During that period generous hospitalities were unceasingly extended to kinsmen and friends at the annual commencements as at all other times; and there are those still living who remember Judge Bayard's kindness while they were students in the seminary or college. He was for several years a member of the New Jersey Legislature, representing the County of Somerset, and for a long period the presiding judge of the Court of Common Pleas for that county. In 1814 Bayard was nominated by the Federalists of his district as their candidate for Congress, but was not elected. After the Federal party had ceased to exist, he took no more active interest in political affairs. He was a trustee of Princeton College, and for many years treasurer of that institution. Bayard was also President of the Board of Trustees of the Theological Seminary as well as one of its founders,† and, like his eminent father, he was for a long time a delegate to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. He was ever active in promoting the cause of religion, and with his kinsman, Elias Boudinot, was one of the founders of the American Bible Society, and of the New Jersey Bible Society. He also aided, with a generous hand, St. Clement's Episcopal Church, New York City, of which his eldest son, the Rev. Lewis Pintard

---

* *Old New York, or Reminiscences of the Past Sixty Years.* Being an enlarged and revised edition of the Anniversary Discourse delivered before the New York Historical Society, November 17th, 1857, by John W. Francis, M.D., LL.D., pp. 73–74. 8vo. New York, 1866.

† At the first meeting of the Board of Trustees in 1824 Bayard was elected Vice-President, in which office he continued until elected to the Presidency of the Board in 1831. He held this position till his death in 1840.

Bayard, was for many years the beloved pastor; and he was for three decades a constant contributor to several religious periodicals. Among Samuel Bayard's separate publications in the speaker's possession may be mentioned:

1.—A Funeral Oration occasioned by the death of Gen. George Washington, delivered on the first day of January, 1800, in the Episcopal Church at New Rochelle, in the State of New York. 8vo, pp. 24, New Brunswick, N. J., 1800.

2.—A Digest of American Cases on the Law of Evidence, intended as notes to Peake's Compendium of the Law of Evidence. 8vo, Philadelphia, 1810.

3.—An Abstract of the Laws of the United States, which relate chiefly to the Duties and Authority of the Judges of the Superior State Courts and the Justices of the Peace throughout the Union. 8vo, New York, 1834.

4.—Letters on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Second edition, 18mo, Philadelphia, 1840. This copy contains the following inscription: "Mrs. Jane Kirkpatrick, from her truly affectionate brother, the Author. Princeton, 19 December, 1839."

The first edition of the letters, which are unsectarian in character, was issued in 1825, and they were greatly admired by John Jay and other pious Episcopalians, and praised by Drs. Alexander, Green, and Miller, of the Presbyterian Church.

Judge Bayard, who was well known and universally esteemed and respected throughout New Jersey and elsewhere in his native land and in England, died at his residence in Princeton, May 12, 1840. Two of his children, as has been stated, died in infancy. Of the six who outlived him, there is but one survivor,* but he is represented by numerous descendants, including his granddaughter, Mrs. Edwin A. Stevens, of Castle Point. One of his grandsons, General Bayard, of New Jersey, who fell on the bloody field of Fredericksburg, won an env.able reputation as among the most brilliant cavalry leaders of either side engaged in the war of the Rebellion.

Before proceeding with the extracts from Samuel Bayard's

* Mrs. Caroline B. Dod, widow of Prof. Albert B. Dod, of Princeton College, who died at that place November 20, 1845.

diary, I will read a portion of a letter written by him to the Attorney General of the United States, announcing his arrival in England:

London, Dec. 18th, 1794.

My Dear Sir,

A short letter which I wrote to my Brother from Falmouth will have appraised yourself and our other friends of our safe arrival in this country. We made no stay at our place of landing, but in company with Mr and Mrs Kirtland and Mrs Edmunston, we set out for London in three post-chaises. We took the route of Bath, understanding that Mr Jay was there. On our arrival we made inquiry and understood that Mr Jay *was* in town. I asked if it was Mr Jay from America. "Yes," said my informant, "Mr Jay from America." "But," said I, "the American Minister." "Yes, Sir he is a minister," was the reply, on which I wrote Mr Jay a note informing him of my arrival and that I would immediately wait on him if agreeable. A servant who took my note inquired for Mr Jay's place of residence but soon returned, saying he could find no John Jay, that the gentleman in Bath was named William and he was an American and a minister.* Here our inquiries terminated, nothing remained but to pursue our journey to London. On our arrival here I saw Mr Jay without the least delay. We have every day conversed on the subject of the appeals and claims.

I shall now give a few extracts from Bayard's journal, with brief comments or explanations when they appear necessary. The first entry is as follows:

Friday 8 May 1795. Called this morning with Mr Slade on Mr Pinckney † with whom I went to Sir William Scott's ‡ chambers. We conferred on the subject of these cases of costs and damages. Agreed that they should rest until we obtained fuller information in regard to them from the United States. In the meantime the claimants are not to suffer by delay. In the evening I went to hear the debate [in the House of Commons] on the subject of Earl Fitz William's recall. I

* Probably the eminent divine, but not an American, whose works have held a high place in the estimation of the religious world for more than the average duration of human life. He died in 1854, aged eighty-five.

† William Pinckney (1764–1822), the eminent lawyer, orator, and statesman, and one of the commissioners under Jay's treaty.

‡ Sir William Scott (1745–1836), afterwards Lord Stowell, then engaged in the American cases.

sent Mr Bradford* an account of the same per the Adriana, Capt Clapp.

Thursday 21 May. Went early to the House of Commons. Orders have been received to admit no one until three o'clock. A great crowd collected. We were admitted and waited till four. Mr Wilberforce's motion to have come on but it was postponed by the pressure of other business.† I took a walk through Westminster Abbey, also into Westminster Hall, where cases were being tried before Lord Kenyon‡ and a jury. Heard Mr Garrow, Mr Murray, and Mr Erskine§ speak successively—Dined with Mr Temple Franklin,‖ W. Morris and others.

A week later Mr. Bayard attends St. Paul's Cathedral to see six thousand charity children, and to hear them sing anthems, etc. In the evening he entertains a large party at dinner, including Benjamin West, among the greatest of American painters. When they first met at Mr. Jay's London residence, the Royal Hotel, Pall Mall, Mr. Bayard says: "Mr. West recognized my resemblance to my father, whose portrait he had painted, and mentioned his hope of again seeing America."

---

* William Bradford (1755–1795), Attorney-General of the United States.

† Elsewhere Mr. Bayard describes Mr. Wilberforce as "a small slender man with much sweetness of disposition and apparently real goodness of heart; a friend of the ministry but yet on principle opposed to the war with France; .his conversation not graceful or easy, but sprightly, entertaining and instructive." Perhaps the highest compliment ever paid by one public man to another was this; when a speaker in the House had sought to sneer down Wilberforce as "the honorable and religious gentleman," the taunt was replied to in a strain of bitter and wrathful sarcasm—that a "British Senate should be required to consider piety a reproach." When a member expressed his astonishment at the power of sarcasm then—for the first time—used by Wilberforce, Sir Samuel Romilly remarked that it illustrated the virtue even more than the genius of Wilberforce, "for who but he has ever possessed so formidable a weapon and never used it?" For three decades after Bayard's return to the United States, he had the honor of corresponding with Wilberforce, and it is a source of regret to his family that all the letters of the last-mentioned have been lost.

‡ Lloyd Kenyon (1733–1802), Chief-Justice of the King's Bench.

§ Garrow, Murray, and Thomas Erskine (1748–1823), eminent lawyers. The latter became in 1806 Lord Chancellor.

‖ William Temple Franklin accompanied his grandfather to France, acting as his secretary. He edited Franklin's Works, and died in Paris, May 25, 1823.

Saturday 30 May. On change and at the cockpit* to-day. Heard the argument in the case of the Nancy belonging to Mr Coopman and others. The President Lord Mansfield against us, the Master of the Rolls with us.

Friday 19 June. Called on Sir William Scott and conversed with him on the subject of American vessels lately brought in. We saw Mr Pitt and other members of the Privy Council on the subject, and it was decided that the vessels should be immediately given up.

Wednesday 1 July. Dined this day at Clapham with Mr Wilberforce.† Conversed chiefly about the slave trade which has received a fatal blow in the West Indies by the insurrections of the negroes.

Saturday 4 July. Accompanied Sir William Scott in his carriage to Richmond arriving there at noon. We walked up Richmond Hill, enjoying the fine prospect and strolled along the banks of the Thames. At four we dined, Dr Lawrence and other gentlemen present, and at eight returned to London. Dr Bancroft related a story of Dr Franklin and his wigmaker at Paris. The fellow having made a wig for the Doctor to appear in at court brought it to his lodgings but it was too small. After trying some time to make it fit, the Doctor became impatient and said it was too small, it would not do. "Oh no," replied the Frenchman, "the wig is not too small, but your head is too large."

July 16. Called on Mr Pitt this morning by appointment. Attended the Lords of Appeal.

Wednesday 16 Sept. This morning a friend called and took me

---

* Not, as might be inferred from the name, a place for fighting cocks, but for legal contests in the Admiralty Courts.

† An undated note in the writer's possession which refers to this or to another similar occasion is as follows:

DEAR SIR,

Will you do me the favor to dine here to-morrow at three o'clock? The hour is fixed so early to enable a gentleman (Mr Granville Sharpe) to return into the country before it is dark. You will excuse my never calling on you. 'Tis mere ceremony: which (knowing we are both engaged) we shall both gladly dispense with.

Your faithful servant,

W. WILBERFORCE.

I shall be glad of a single line in answer.

Friday. Addressed SAMUEL BAYARD, ESQ., Hatton Garden.

Granville Sharpe (1734–1813), instituted the Society for the Abolition of the Slave Trade and distinguished himself by his zeal in devising measures for the extensive distribution of the Bible. He and Bayard became intimate friends.

to Mr Ireland's, No 8 Norfolk street W. Strand, who has lately been presented with a copy of some of Shakespeare's manuscripts. I was much interested with the sight of the new play "Vertigern," in the author's own handwriting, and in his "King Lear," which is materially different in several parts from the editions extant. The following also pleased me greatly, as they are originals:

Queen Elizabeth's letter to Shakespeare and his answer.
Earl Southampton's " " " " " " *

Wednesday 23 Sept. I had the pleasure of meeting my friend Dr Tate on the Stand to day at the Doncaster races. The Stand is a large house built for the purpose of affording a perfect view of the horses around the entire course. You pay half a guinea for the privilege of seeing the races from this place. All the *gentry* and *nobility* resort here—the *mobility* of whom I saw several thousands to-day, are on the ground.

Thursday 29 Oct. This day I went to Westminster to see the parade attending the King's meeting Parliament. I had a place very near the door where George the Third entered in going to the House of Peers, and saw the whole farce distinctly. I was in hopes to hear the King's speech, but was disappointed by the Marquis of Lansdowne not coming to the House in time, but a ticket was sent to gain me admittance to the debate next evening.

Friday 30 Oct. I went this morning to hear the debate in the House of Peers on the King's speech. Lord Grenville spoke very well, Lord Lauderdale was animated as Earl Mansfield was dull, but the Marquis of Lansdowne, always full of information, pleased me most of all.

Monday 16 Nov. Attended the people's meeting to day, and heard the Duke of Bedford and also Mr Gray distinctly read the petition. I heard Mr Sheridan's † speech very plainly. The minds of the people seem to be generally agitated.

---

* Mr. Bayard refers to the celebrated Ireland forgeries. *Vide* The Confessions of William Henry Ireland, containing the Particulars of his Publication of the Shakespeare Manuscripts. Fac-similes and Introduction by Richard Grant White, New York, 1874.

† Of another occasion when Bayard heard the eloquent Irishman in the House of Commons he says in his diary: "Went to hear Mr Sheridan's motion debated for repealing the Act suspending the Habeas Corpus. His speech, which lasted three hours was elaborate, animated, various. Sometimes humorous, pathetic, sentimental, argumentative. His voice was distinctly audible, his enunciation

Monday 30 Nov. Engaged all the morning in closing my dispatches for the United States. Attended Mr Proctor's on business. I understood from Sir William Scott that Lord Grenville concurred in the arrangement proposed respecting the cases of cost and damage. Went this evening to Drury Lane and saw the tragedy of Alexander the Great. Mrs Siddons and Kemble performed wonderfully.

Saturday 5 Dec. In the evening went to the Merchant's dinner. Very elegant and about 150 present : Lords Grenville and Spencer, the Duke of Portland, Sir John Sinclair, Mr Dundas etc., in the company. Music played while we dined. After dinner many toasts were drank—the King—the Prince of Wales, Mr Jay, the army and navy etc. I sat precisely as last year, between Sir John Sinclair and Mr Maitland.*

Thursday 10 Dec. A large party dined with us to-day ; Mr Adams, Mr West, and many others. The party was pleasant.

Monday, 11 January, 1796. My birthday : 29 years of age. Our friends Mr Vandam's family dined with us. The last year of my life has passed more usefully to my fellow citizens than any previous one. The satisfaction of being useful to others is surely the chief aim and happiness of life.

Thursday 14 Jany. Called on Mr Burke. A Mr Cochran here a brother of Capt Cochran of the Thetis, man of war. A very sensible person. He speaks of General Washington and Lord Cornwallis as the two greatest men in the world.

---

proper, his gestures graceful, in short the greatest orator I have ever heard. . . . Mr Fox followed with a fine speech which made a visible impression on the House. Mr Pitt replied, but he did not appear to advantage."

* At the dinner referred to, December 17, 1794, Mr. Bayard was introduced by the chairman to William Pitt, Lord Grenville, Sir John Sinclair, Bart., and to William Wilberforce. When Pitt died in 1806, Bayard in a letter to a friend quoted the well-known last words of his illustrious acquaintance. From a poem which appeared lately from the pen of Lord Lytton, it appears that Pitt did not utter the words attributed to him :

"Oh England ! Oh my country !" These are not
The last words spoken by the lips of Pitt ;
And that's unlucky, for the words have got
A fine grandiloquence that seems to fit
Lips so sententious. I've been told that what
Was really said (but I'll not vouch for it)
By that great man before death closed his eyes
Was—"Bring me one of Bellamy's veal pies."
—GLEN-AVERIL—or the METAMORPHOSIS. London, 1885.

[I imagine Bayard and Cochran are the only human beings that ever ranked Cornwallis with Washington.]

Thursday 18 Feby. Never did I rise with a sweeter impression on my mind than this morning. I have been during a part of the past night (in spirit) among my friends in America with Mr Boudinot,* Mr Pintard and Mrs Bradford at New Rochelle and with what delight did they receive me.

Monday 22 Feby. This is the President's birthday. After the business of the day, dined at Mr Pinckney's with a large party of Americans. Washington's health drank with many happy returns of the day to him.

Monday 29 Feby. Was this morning at Doctors Commons ; afterwards on Change. Dined at Lord Lansdowne's. The service very splendid, with seven liveried servants. Mrs Pinckney, Mrs Penn, Mrs Bayard, and other ladies present. Lord Lansdowne conversed chiefly with Mr Temple Franklin, who has just arrived from Paris. Lord L. is a person of very extensive information who courts the company of men of intelligence and learning. His library is a grand one of more than ten thousand volumes.

Friday 18 March. Received this day when in the city letters from my father, my sister Kirkpatrick, my brother, Miss Bradford and Mr Boudinot. It is impossible to describe the pleasure which these letters gave me. The affectionate style of Mr Boudinot's made a very powerful impression on us both.

31 December 1796. Another year closes this day. How eventful it has been ! To us it has passed agreeably and brought many comforts with it. How grateful we should be to the Giver of every good for His continued mercies.

---

* Elias Boudinot, 1740–1821, Commissary General of the Revolutionary Army, and Lewis Pintard, who acted as his deputy, married sisters of Richard Stockton, of New Jersey. Boudinot was President of Congress in 1782, and the first President of the American Bible Society. He was deeply attached to Col. Bayard and to his son Samuel. In the last conversation the distinguished philanthropist had with the subject of this paper, he said very solemnly : " I commit to your care, my dear Bayard, my beloved and only daughter." And his last whispered words before he passed away were : " Take care of my daughter." She survived her husband, William Bradford, fifty-eight years, her father, Dr. Boudinot, thirty-two years, and her friend, Samuel Bayard, thirteen years, dying at Burlington, November 30, 1853.

So concludes Samuel Bayard's London diary, from which, did time permit, I should have been glad to give additional extracts. This may possibly be done hereafter. It may be added that Bayard and his associates obtained from the British government, for losses sustained by Americans from illegal and unauthorized captures of their ships on the high seas by English cruisers, the sum of $10,345,000.

His eldest son's biographer says:

"The Hon. Samuel Bayard whose talents and virtues will long be remembered, not only in the world in which he filled many official stations, most honorably, but also in that large and respectable body of Christians in which he was a zealous, devoted and efficient member, was sent by the United States government to England, residing in London during a period of four years." *

To have known Washington, Franklin—who died one hundred years ago to-day—Hamilton, Jay, and John Adams, and frequently to have seen George the Third and his Cabinet Ministers who were opposed to those great men in the Revolutionary struggle; to have been well acquainted with many of the American generals engaged in that conflict, and with their antagonists Lord Cornwallis, Sir Henry Clinton, and Col. Tarleton; to have been on terms of intimacy with six of the signers of the Declaration of Independence; and to have known Lords Eldon, Mansfield and Stowell, Burke and Barré, Fox and Pitt, Sheridan, Wilberforce, and Warren Hastings, is certainly a very remarkable record for a young American of

---

* Memorial of the Rev. Lewis Pintard Bayard, D.D., New York, 1841. An elegant tablet in St. Clement's Church, New York City, erected by his sorrowing congregation, records that he was,

"A native of New Jersey:
The first Rector, and for ten years the faithful Minister of this Church.
Died September 2d, A. D. 1840,
On his homeward passage from Jerusalem,
At the Island of Malta,
Where his remains were deposited,
In the 50th year of his age.
And the 29th of his Ministry."

Dr. Bayard was also for seven years (1813–1820) Rector of Trinity Church, Newark, New Jersey.

thirty. This was doubtless owing in good part, at home, to his birth and family connections, and abroad, to his official position, but much more to his own charming character. His country and this society should certainly cherish the memory of Samuel Bayard, and of his patriotic father Col. John Bayard. They were beautiful Christian characters who, in the words of the poet Wordsworth, left behind them "trailing clouds of glory,"—

> "Far may we search before we find
> Two hearts so manly and so kind."

THE RETRIBUTION OF LOUIS XIV.*

By James W. Gerard, LL.D.

When Pope Clement VIII. heard that Henry IV. was about to abjure his Protestantism, and become a Roman Catholic, he put little credence in the sincerity of the king, and said to the French emissary who was sent to placate him, "Do not tell me that your king is a Catholic. I shall never believe that he is really converted, unless an angel came from heaven to assure me that he is."

In truth, Henry was not a very sincere penitent. The son of Jeanne d'Albret could hardly become so, at his time of life. His strong affections and affiliations were with Protestantism, and with his old comrades in arms, who had stood by him during a series of conflicts that had covered France with blood, and shaken the kingdom to its foundations.

Never had sectarianism been more determined, more bitter, more diffused and more bloody in any one land. The kingdom, too, was not only torn by internecine strife, but harassed by Spanish invasion. Humanity called for a pause, concession seemed the only remedy, the king was willing to listen to "instruction" in the old faith, the instruction was given by learned prelates, the mysterious doctrines of the mass and immaculacy were digested, the Pope became formally reconciled and gave his absolution. The logic of events controlled all qualms of conscience or bitterness of memory; and with tears in his eyes, in July, 1593, the redoubtable warrior, king of a divided country, made his public abjuration of the faith of his fathers and of the heroes who had bled with him in the cause of conscience and religion. James II., it has been sarcastically observed, gave up three kingdoms for a mass, and Henry gained a kingdom by a mass. Unlike James, however, whose mass disturbed the public peace, Henry by a mass restored it.

---

* Read before the Huguenot Society, March 20th, 1890.

In the spring of 1594 Henry made his entry into the long-besieged city of Paris, the public acts of the League were formally annulled, and the country was pacified under the first of the Bourbon kings. The many subsequent concessions of Henry to the Catholics, however, and his recognition of their religion, as exclusively that of the State, and the hindrance of Protestants from pursuing their worship in the principal cities, so aroused the Huguenots in opposition that they firmly refused to aid the king, then defending the realm against the Spaniards, until their rights were publicly conceded and recognized by a definite public compact. Hence resulted the famous Edict of Nantes, which was signed by the king, in that city, in April, 1598, and subsequently solemnly registered as a great public act of the State.

The main features of this famous edict, as is well known to readers of history, after reciting the recent frightful public troubles and disorders and the success with which he had been at last able to restore peace to the kingdom, proclaim that the king could not now better employ the quiet that had been granted him, than in making provision that God might be worshiped by all his subjects in peace and tranquillity. Proclamation was made that Protestants might dwell anywhere in the kingdom without molestation or restraint as regards their conscientious belief, and public Protestant worship was accorded in many cities. Protestants might meet for counsel and religious communion, anywhere, and religious services might be performed on their estates by the nobility. Children might be educated in the reformed religion, and universities, schools, colleges, hospitable and charitable institutions were to be open to all equally.

Provision was made for the enjoyment of all civic rights and emoluments to Protestants, justice was to be administered to all without distinction, and provision was even made for the partial support of Protestant ministers from the public treasury. Although denounced by the Pope as "a damnable and accursed thing," the Edict of Nantes was a grand step forward in the progress of tolerance and civilization, and was the noblest feature of the reign. It was alike opportune, just, and humane.

It fulfilled a grand moral and political obligation. It was openly accepted on all sides as binding, and recognized as an irrevocable and fundamental law of the State.

In spite of the edict, however, the elements of a long discord were still seething—the passions and madness of sectarianism were too strong and too bitter to be suddenly set at rest by any compact or composition. Discussion and dissension first arose as to practically carrying out the terms of the edict. Twelve years of religious liberty, however, and comparative concord, blessed the kingdom and healed the wounds of a series of internecine wars. At this time the Huguenot population is estimated to have consisted of a million and a quarter of souls—many of whom were admitted to high office in the State. Of course I am not here able to review, at any length, the fortunes of the Reformed religion in France, from the decease of Henry, by the hands of a fanatic assassin, to the time of the revocation of the great edict of toleration. After the decease of Henry there became manifest a disposition in the French Government, generally under Jesuit influence, not only to curtail the religious liberty heretofore accorded, but to restrict certain political powers of the Huguenots which had been specially accorded to them for their protection, and gave them a strong influence in the State. Not only the Government became jealous of the increasing numbers and power of the Protestants, but the Roman Catholic priesthood, from the pulpit, re-kindled the ancient sectarian animosity ; and, finally, a continuous series of encroachments on their rights, under Louis XIII., drove the Huguenots in many parts of France into open resistance.

The grand ideas of Richelieu, as prime minister, were to concentrate the power of the Crown and strengthen the hand of the Church. To both of these Protestantism was an impediment; and, therefore, both as minister and priest, Richelieu was unremitting in his action to diminish the importance of Protestantism, both as a civil and religious institution. After putting down all resistance, and driving thousands into exile, who flew for freedom and repose to England, Holland, and the new settlements of America, Protestantism no longer existed

in France, except on the terms of perfect submission to government.

The political rights of Protestantism under the edict of Henry IV. were virtually abrogated; and its religious existence was the result, no longer of solemn compact, but of a frowning tolerance, that daily became less inclined to indulgence. Under the latter part of the administration of Richelieu, in the stormy days of the Fronde, and under Mazarin, there was a comparative rest for the persecuted religionists; and they continued to form a large, useful, skilled and industrious part of the great population of France. But the clouds of bigotry were again gathering, soon to burst in a manner even more terrible and destructive than in the memorable days of St. Bartholomew.

During the few years before Louis XIV. took upon himself the reins of government, various edicts and ordinances were passed, seriously impairing the rights of Protestants, in their worship. These measures became more and more intolerant under pressure from the Roman Catholic hierarchy, jealous of the progress of an opposing and intrusive religion; and soon a persistent, active, and in the end, a most sanguinary State persecution began against all professing the Reformed faith, contemptuously termed "heretics." Then came decrees, in 1665 and 1666, allowing Protestant children to change their religion, in spite of their parents; and churchmen became busy in snatching "heretic" children from the "Devil." Edicts authorizing priests to go to the bedside of dying Protestants when ill, and prohibiting the establishment of academies by Protestants, and regulating the forms of their religion, were also passed.

Restrained by the wise and just counsels of Colbert, Louis refrained, for a time, from further aggression upon his Protestant subjects. In 1674, however, and down to the final revocation of the great edict, the oppression of the Protestants was resumed and continued in a manner as politically unwise as it was arbitrary and cruel.

By various new edicts and decrees, children could be taken from their parents, backsliders were punished with banishment

and confiscation; Protestants were excluded from public functions, their chapels were demolished, Reformers were excluded from leasing the Crown farms, mixed marriages were interdicted, troops guilty of barbarous excesses were billeted upon Protestant families, and property of the churches was confiscated; to all this was added the horror of military tribunals and executions without trial. Those who sought to leave the country were arrested by spies and guards, and terrible penalties were inflicted upon fugitives when apprehended. All these barbarous measures, and the supposed conversion of many to the "faith," were considered as adding greatly to the glory of the king's reign; and, indeed, to place a celestial halo around his head. In the enthusiasm of his bigoted zeal, and to swell the number of converts, Louis devoted one-third of his "economies" to the cause; many were brought to a supposed state of conversion through the eloquence of six livres apiece, and the king was as highly extolled for invading and subduing the kingdom of Satan as for conquests over the Spaniards and the Dutch.

His religious zeal in this regard, when flagging, was stimulated by the expostulations of Madame de Maintenon, by whose special direction many of the arrests were made; and by Père la Chaise, the adroit and insinuating Jesuit confessor and ally of Maintenon; and even by the virtuous Bossuet, all of whom had combined to set up this new school of religious reform, assisted by the brutal soldiery directed by Louvois—all banded together in order to obtain the salvation of the king, the aggrandizement of Rome, and their own favor at Court, either by the conversion or destruction of thousands of their fellow-citizens. In 1678 Madame de Maintenon writes: "The king is full of good sentiments; he sometimes reads the Scriptures, and he thinks them the best of all books; he recognizes and avows his weaknesses and faults. We must wait until grace reaches him. He thinks seriously of the conversion of the heretics, and soon we will set to work at it." "The king," Madame de Maintenon writes, in August, 1681, "begins to think seriously of his salvation and of that of his subjects. If God preserves him to us there will be no longer but

one religion in the kingdom." This being freely interpreted, meant increasing persecution and the complete interdiction of the Reformed worship.

Troops were let loose afresh upon the Protestants in Anjou, Dauphiny, Guienne and Languedoc; and the Court boasted of the so-called conversion of hundreds of terrified Protestants, who were beaten and dragooned and crazed into a temporary apostasy. "There is not a courier," writes Madame de Maintenon, in September, 1685, "that does not bring the king great causes of joy in the news of conversion, by thousands."

The glorification of Louis at these spiritual triumphs over his feeble subjects, was sounded by prelate and courtier; he began to feel that he was at the head of a holy mission—a crusade to extirpate a great heresy—and the entire and formal Revocation of the Edict of Nantes soon followed. This outrage was perpetrated under the immediate advice of Père la Chaise and the Minister Louvois, stimulated by the bigot De Maintenon.

On October 17, 1685, the Revocation was formally signed that made this unholy reign peculiarly infamous—and an order followed for the demolition of all the remaining Protestant churches in France. Reformers were prohibited from leaving the kingdom, under the penalty of the galleys for life and confiscation of all their property; other terrible orders followed, and soldiers were given license, by their brutality, to hasten the making of converts. Torture, imprisonment, robbery, and wholesale slaughter were part of the machinery employed, to all which the clergy gave their zealous accord. The Vaudois, who took refuge in Piedmont, were butchered in masses by the troops of France and subsequently of Savoy, and new pæans went up in praise of the great king. "Let us pour forth our hearts in praise of Louis," preached the truckling Bossuet, in his panegyric over the remains of Chancellor le Tellier, who drew up the infamous Edict of Revocation; "let us lift our acclamations to Heaven,—and let us say to this new Constantine—to this new Theodosius—to this new Marcianus—to this new Charlemagne, 'You have strengthened the faith—

you have exterminated the heretics—this is the meritorious work of your reign—its peculiar characteristic. Through you, heresy is no more !—God alone could have wrought this great wonder ! ' "

Statues were raised and medals struck to this new pillar of the faith ; poets twanged the fulsome lyre ; litterateurs and pulpit orators ceased not to exalt his name ; and " Te Deums " pealed throughout the land, echoing those offered up by direction of the Pope, at Rome, in commemoration of the great work carried on by this (inaptly styled) " Most Christian King ! "

After the Revocation, the Government redoubled its vigor to prevent emigration, and those seeking to escape were sent to the galleys and their goods confiscated. Desolation reigned throughout the persecuted provinces ; revolting cruelties were perpetrated, under the orders of the king and his inhuman minister, by dragoon and priest ; and new modes of torture were invented by the intendents of provinces, seeking thus to curry favor at Court ; pastors reëntering the kingdom were punished with death ; and infants were seized at the breast. All Protestant schools were closed, the Bible was burnt by the executioner, gentlemen of rank and name were sent to the galleys, the heads of ladies were shaved for singing the Psalms of David in French, pastors were broken on the wheel for not having abandoned their flocks, old men were dragged to the Romish altars by blaspheming soldiers who ordered them to worship their God, those relapsing were thrown into dungeons, parents were condemned on the charge of their children, and children were torn from parents and died starving or insane in dungeons or Jesuit colleges and convents. Roman priests were forced upon the dying, and those abetting Protestants in their escape were condemned to death. In ten years' time more than ten thousand persons became the prey of the wheel, the stake, and the gibbet. Under the accumulation of horrors imposed upon them French Protestants, many of them men of military renown, rushed from their native land in spite of spies and guards. More than 200,000—some estimate the number as high as 500,000—fled into exile during these

twenty years of oppression, and sought refuge in England, Germany, Holland, and Denmark, where they became useful citizens, and added the wealth of their skilled industry to the states that sheltered them; and very many turned their arms, in spite of lingering patriotism, against the tyrant who had oppressed them. Large numbers who remained and adopted, in form, the Roman Catholic faith, became neither actual converts nor contented subjects. This hypocritical conformity was to many the only refuge from the persecution which followed them even on their death-beds and to the tomb—for this was a part of the Edict of April 29, 1686: "Protestants who are sick and refuse the viaticum are to be considered and punished as apostates if they return to health—the men are to be condemned to the galleys for life, the women to prison, and to the loss of their property; in case of death their goods are to be sold, their bodies unearthed and thrown into a ditch!" If a converted person refused the sacrament when dying, a review of the case was held over the remains, and the body was ordered to be dragged in quicklime so as to be a terror to others. Through the above emigration, the most useful subjects of France and many good soldiers were lost to the State; and this extraordinary persecution has been considered by all modern historians of every faith, as not only a great moral crime, but an extraordinary political blunder. The loss of so many subjects perceptibly weakened the kingdom, and made it less prepared for the sanguinary war of the "Spanish Succession," soon to follow; and the cruelties practised embittered the Protestant princes of Europe against France, and promoted their alliances to oppose her.

Individual cases that make the generalities of history when presented give a dramatic aspect to the subject, and awaken an interest and sympathy, that, under a general statement, are not experienced. The Marquis de Sourches, a contemporary, who kept a journal of his times, which has recently appeared, gives many instances in illustration of the treatment of the French Reformers.

In November, 1685, he states that the king sent Major Artagan and 200 soldiers to Villias-le-bel, to compel the

Huguenots to become converted. But only a few remnants of families remained, the rest having taken flight under apprehension that troops would be sent against them. He writes in December, '85, of Huguenots trying to flee the kingdom by forcing a passage against soldiers guarding it, in Dauphiné, and, finding a bridge broken, their flight was arrested by troops, who slaughtered the most of them.

As to the mode of conversion, the marquis writes: "The dragoons, at that time, made more conversions in eight days than the missionaries could make in a year. This style of conversion was rather new, but it had good results; and if conversions were not altogether sincere, on the side of parents, it was effective at least in gaining over their children."

The persecution continued unremittingly throughout the remainder of the reign; and in 1704–5 general revolts in the Cevennes and elsewhere gained such headway that marshals of France were sent for their suppression. De Sourches states that in January, 1705, the troops made a murderous attack on the fanatics in the mountains, and devastated the country for twenty miles, burning all the cottages and putting to the sword all that were met with, not sparing even women and children. In April, 1704, he speaks of a Lieut.-Gen. Lalande having massacred a troop of 600 of the Protestant insurgents; then, chasing them, killed 100; and then, attacking others escaping from an attack by Marshal Montreel, killed 200 more.

In all about 2,000 were destroyed, many having taken refuge in caves, and being there killed; or they cut their own throats, to save themselves from capture. 1704, De Sourches says that Villars, in fighting against Roland, had made a good beginning by putting to the sword all fanatics found with arms. In May, 1705, he writes that the merchants in parts of Languedoc, who extended aid to Huguenots, were massacred.

I will now produce a contemporaneous account which gives a vivid picture of the mode of conversion practised at this period. It is an extract from the Memoirs of Daniel de Cosnac, Archbishop of Aix, and at one time one of the Council of the

king, who in his Memoirs states that it was a source of glory to him that, even before the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, he had destroyed all the Protestant places of worship in his diocese.

He thus writes: "I retired to my diocese, and hardly had I arrived there when dragoons were sent in all the places where there were any Huguenots. I relaxed no efforts in trying to make conversions, either by my teaching, or by the effect of favors or of money. My care was not without reward—scarcely ever failing to succeed. I admit that the fear of the dragoons, and of their being quartered in the houses of the heretics, might have done more than my exertions. This lasted over two years; and that which particularly advanced conversions was an assembly of Huguenots, which took place in the territories of my bishopric; and where 4,000 men were assembled to defend themselves and their heresy. Monsieur de St. Ruth, who commanded the troops, having attacked and routed them, burned more than two hundred, who had taken refuge in a barn. A great number of prisoners were taken, and the rest dispersed—not daring to reappear. Those who were taken were condemned to die by the hands of the executioner. All the prisons in my diocese were full of these wretched people, and the Intendent executed several of them when their trials were finished. It was a terrible spectacle!"

In another place the archbishop writes of the fate of a Huguenot minister, who, with another, had been put under arrest; and thus records this story of blood: "These two ministers were in prison in the city of Tournon, in my diocese, and I learned that they had been tried, and that the Minister Homel, who was highly esteemed by his party, had been condemned to be broken alive on the wheel, and his body exposed in four places of the district where he had lived as minister over thirty years; his companion was adjudged to be hung.

"I felt constrained to go to Tournon, to try and rescue these men out of their miserable condition, if possible—both their bodies and souls. On arriving at the locality in the city where the gallows was erected, I saw the executioner holding

captive the second minister, who was clad in his shirt, with a rope about his neck, by which the executioner was leading him. I cried out with all my strength, 'Stop the execution!' and, arriving on the spot, I advanced and took the minister out of the hands of the executioner; and, having taken him into a neighboring house, I exhorted him to consider how Divine Providence had sent me to his aid, and to save his soul. The man resisted for some time, and seemed firm in the midst of such great danger; but, in less than an hour, he promised to abjure his heresy, and, in fact, the next day he made the renunciation, apparently in good faith, acknowledging that he was satisfied with the reasons that I advanced in response to his inquiries. After having finished this, I spoke with him as to the minister Homel, and asked in what condition I would find him, whether he would not feel like acting as the other had. He took all hope of this from me by stating that Homel was prepared for any suffering, and would not listen to anything I could say toward his conversion. However, as I was in the place where the man was confined, I entered into a dungeon where I found him imprisoned; and, having caused him to be seated near me, I commenced by calling his attention to the unfortunate condition in which he was placed. He replied, with firmness, that he was aware of it, and was even, thanks to God, contented with it, and quoted several passages of Scripture. After having let him speak for some time, we entered into the reasons by which he was persuaded that he was in the true path. There was no fundamental point of the controversy left undiscussed.

"I was more than four hours in this conference with him. I did not speak of removing him from the prison where he was placed, and gave him no particular hope of his life. He told me, however, that if he had time to reflect on what I had told him, he thought God would direct him what he had better do —but now he was under sentence of immediate death. I told him that, to save his soul, there was sufficient time, and that he ought to profit by God's mercy. He recognized by this remark that there was no hope for him, and I declared to him that I had still authority to open the heavens for him, but not

to let him live on the earth; so that, finding no way of saving him, I left him to his fate. He was broken on the wheel alive, the next day."

I will also refer to an extract from the "History of the Bastile," by Renneville, published in 1715. "The same person assured me that, at Vitry le François, when he was a young scholar there, he saw a woman, entirely naked, dragged upon sharp hurdles, whose crime was her having died professing the Reformed religion, and that afterward she was thrown on the highway, whereupon the scholars perpetrated a thousand indignities upon the poor corpse. They burned with straw all the skin off the body, and committed infamies that decency will not permit me to recount, and which would be revolting to the most savage breasts. Meanwhile the husband, overcome by the fate of the poor victim, lamented with burning tears, and threw himself at the feet of the wives of her judges, supplicating them to have compassion on the unfortunate remains of one of their sex, while those ladies could do nothing but answer him with tears, with sighs and signs of their helplessness. My narrator now said, he asked pardon of God with all his heart for having been one of the most despicable actors in this terrible tragedy."

But enough of these harrowing pictures. A Moloch was stalking about the land, demanding sacrifices of human blood; but a stern *Nemesis*—daughter of Night, the humbler of the proud, the avenger of crime—was holding the sword that was soon to smite the great king in all that was dear; to strike off his crown of glory for one of shame, and to bring him and his kingdom to sorrow and humiliation.

In the meanwhile, amid the devastation and bloodshed, the festivities and gayeties of the Court went on in all their sumptuousness. There was no thought of pity, no sting of remorse, no cessation of revelry. The Court, with its debauched nobility, its bedizened dames, and spangled sycophants, went from place to place in search of fresh delights. Comedies and masquerades, lotteries and gaming at Marly and Chambord, hunting excursions and water parties at Fontainebleau and Compiègne and St. Germain. Versailles resounded

with the gayety of concerts, ballets, and reviews; and St. Cloud was merry with tournaments and carrousels.

Revelry beguiled the hour, while France was being decimated by persecution and military and judicial murder.

The blind sectarianism that brought about the national crime of the Revocation and the attendant persecutions is one of the mysteries of history. The age was one of enlightenment, of refinement, and of great mental development, and justice and clemency were broadly recognized. The persons too who were mainly instrumental in bringing about the Edict of Revocation and conducting the persecutions, except, perhaps, Louvois, the most pitiless executioner of the king's wishes, were persons of mild and amiable character, and in their lives otherwise displayed enlarged views of justice and philanthropy.

Le Tellier, who displayed as Chancellor a fanaticism which caused more injury to France than all the wars sustained at that time against combined Europe, was of a gentle temper and honorable conduct, without pretension, and restraining all passion; on his death, however, at the age of eighty-two, he exclaimed that he quitted life without regret, since he had been so happy as to have fixed his seal to the declaration which was to destroy the Protestant religion. François de la Chaise, the confessor of the king, another prime mover in the Revocation and a strong ally of Madame de Maintenon, by ingratiating himself with the king, became the virtual head of ecclesiastical affairs. Although a principal promoter of the great rigors exercised in the name of religion, he was in other matters of an upright character, just, modest, honorable, and humane.

As to Madame de Maintenon, she was of a disposition calm, reasonable, and benevolent. From her influence with the king, she was virtually a dictator in the land, and could have, no doubt, influenced him to mercy and tolerance; but she exerted no influence in that direction, and is supposed to have fanned, rather than to have sought to extinguish, the flames of persecution. After her morganatic marriage with the king, she made it a case of conscience to render him a religious devotee, and governed him through his religious fears.

Charlotte Elizabeth d'Orleans, wife of the king's brother, who was behind the scenes at the French Court, in one of her letters to a German friend, thus forcibly gives her testimony against De Maintenon and Père la Chaise: "Before that old hag reigned here, religion in France was reasonable, but she destroyed all that by her bigotry and foolish devotions, and when people wished to be reasonable, the old woman and the confessor threw them into prison or exiled them. They are, both of them, the cause of all the persecutions in France, directed against the poor Reformers and Lutherans. That long-eared Jesuit commenced operations in accord with the old hag, and Father le Tellier, the second confessor, carried it to the end. By their operations France has been entirely ruined."

The great author of the national crime, however, was the king. He too was of a mild and gracious and generous character: his largesses were numerous, his charities were extensive, and the pardoning power was continually exercised. Although rigorous in his religious observances, the king's religion was, however, without light, breadth, or charity. It seemed now to be adopted as a means of palliation, and to cull favor with a higher power, thereby to procure absolution for a past life of vice and deeds of selfishness and crime.

An anecdote, related by St. Simon, seems to prove that Louis was more of a bigot than a religionist. When the Duke d'Orleans presented the name of one Fontpertius for an appointment, the king exclaimed: "What! Fontpertius, the son of a Jansenist! I do not wish that man to go with you." "By my faith, sire," replied the duke, "I know not what the mother is, but as for the son, he is far enough from being a Jansenist, for he does not believe in God." "Is it possible, my nephew?" replied the king, softening. "Nothing more certain, sire, I assure you." "Well, since it is so," said the king, "there is no harm; you can take him with you."

But another and lower motive instigated the king. Louis' thirst for power and rule was the paramount feature of his character. Blinded by success, and infatuated by flattery, he could not brook defeat; and was jealous of all merit, power,

or glory in others; and disliked all who made any opposition to his will. He considered the Reformers as opponents of his wishes, and enemies to his rule; and he destroyed them, not so much from religious conviction as because he was tenacious of his authority.

Vain of his judgment, he wanted all others to agree with him, and claimed the right to think for the rest of France. It was no difficult task, says a contemporary, for the Jesuits to persuade him that a great blow struck against the Protestants would give his name more grandeur than any of his ancestors had acquired, besides strengthening his power and increasing his authority. Under the above views, Louis' devotion became a cruel bigotry and his vanity a scourge; he exalted himself into an apostle, and his vanity united to his bigotry made him a persecutor even to madness.

Although all France was filled with dismay and confusion, the extraordinary apathy of the French people at large, not only to the horrors of the persecution, but to the mistaken policy of depopulating the state of thousands of its most useful citizens, was extraordinary. But, as has been remarked, like all those insane persons who are perfectly sane on all subjects but one, the French people gave lessons to Europe on all sciences, but remained in complete childhood as to the principles of natural right—as to the only science which does not require to be learned, but which is engraved on every heart.

One prominent voice was, however, raised in protest and in defiance. The Marquis du Guiscard made an appeal to Frenchmen at large, and endeavored to start a league both of Protestants and Catholics against the tyranny and persecutions of the day. I will give an extract of a letter from him to De Chamillard, Minister of War to the king.

"You claim that I am acting against my king. Where is this king of whom you speak? I know of no king in France; there is nothing now but an illusory name, and an empty, vain and baleful ghost of one. Shall I regard as my king a prince who has reduced all his subjects to misery and slavery, and who is guided only by caprice or ambition, or by unbridled passions which have been fatal to the kingdom—a prince

who has usurped all the privileges and rights of the public and of the citizen, and taken from the Parliament all its laws? Shall I regard as my king one who, preferring the splendor and aggrandizement of his house to that of the nation, has plunged his country in a contest which will be only finished by his complete overthrow?"

The question as to whether punishment for wrong is inflicted and compensation for good work is meted in this world, has been often a subject of thought. Compensation for goodness is not always displayed to finite eyes; retribution for evil is often seen, and the stings of remorse may bring punishment where no open retribution is visible.

For the great French king, at least, history records a sad retribution. After many years of despotic power, of conquest, and of so-called glory—after widespread wars, whereby the power of the king was so extended that he became almost the dictator of Europe—the War of the Spanish Succession, lasting over eleven years, arising from the desire of Louis to place his grandson on the throne of Spain, began a chain of humiliations.

The French arms, hitherto almost always triumphant, met with defeat and disaster. At the battle of Blenheim, in 1704, the French and Bavarian troops were defeated with great slaughter; and more than 14,000 intrenched in the village of Blenheim, waiting for the order to move, were taken prisoners. By this great blow the prestige of the French troops in Europe was lost, and Louis began to feel the first of a series of defeats that fortune had in store for him.

Marlborough and Eugene now moved about Germany and Flanders, resistless as ministers of fate. Fortress after fortress was taken in Flanders, and the armies of the Allies threatened the frontier of France. At the battle of Ramillies, in 1706, Marshal Villeroy and his army of 80,000 men were defeated in a little over an hour. In the subsequent battle of Oudenarde, Marlborough and Eugene again defeated the French, in a pitched battle, and all Flanders was lost to France.

In the midst of the drain upon the population and resources of France caused by this prolonged war, the plague of famine

appeared, and the winter of 1708–9 was unexampled in its severity: even the sea froze along the coasts, and there was a complete destruction of all vegetation. Innumerable were the people who died of hunger and misery; the hospitals were full to repletion and the cry for bread resounded throughout the streets. The Government could no longer pay interest on its debt; trade no longer yielded anything; good faith and confidence were at an end.

After this terrible winter, in the spring of 1709, France, as it may be supposed, was in a deplorable condition. The misfortunes of war had dispirited alike king and people; and the horrors of famine and the rigors of a winter of extraordinary inclemency had carried death and misery to every class. France seemed completely worn out; conscriptions had denuded the country of its laborers; the peasantry were dragged unwillingly to the war—often in chains; and brigands and outlaws were freely enlisted and paraded before the humiliated king.

All peace negotiations, too, had failed. The Allies, and especially the emperor, were implacable; and nothing less than an invasion into France and its entire subjection seemed probable.

Such was the condition of France—of that great kingdom, whose monarch a few years back had made all the sceptres of Europe tremble: her finances ruined; her public credit gone; the land exhausted; the people beggared and dying of hunger; her armies discouraged by continuous defeats; her fortresses taken; her provinces in revolt; her integrity threatened; while her inveterate enemies, the hated English and the long-despised Dutch, were menacing her with utter annihilation. And he who had been dictator to Europe, whose glory had been represented as a halo encircling the head of a divinity, and who was styled on his medals, "The perpetual Conqueror"! —without ally and without resources, in bemoaning his fate, while reciting his failures, although actually begging for peace, exclaimed, with tears in his eyes, in open council, "I am unable now either to make war or peace."

The effect of all this on the minds of the suffering people

was terrible: pamphlets and squibs were issued innumerable, denouncing the king, his character, his morals, his conduct, and his government. Cries for bread were shouted in the streets; princes, ministers, and generals were mobbed; and armed revolts occurred in Paris and several of the provinces.

In the midst of this came the terrible battle of Malplaquet, the bloodiest of the war, at which the French had to retire from the field with a loss of between 15,000 and 20,000 men.

Her fortresses taken, her frontiers unprotected, her armies destroyed, her great generals defeated, her finances exhausted, and her realm depopulated—the Allies would certainly have penetrated into France and subjugated the kingdom, had not the extraordinary defection of England from the Alliance, procured, at Utrecht, through the manipulations of Bolingbroke and Harley, a pacification, by which, although France and Spain lost much of their possessions, the territory of France was saved from invasion. Prince Eugene wrote afterward in his Memoirs: "But for the English I should have given law in the capital of the Grand Monarque and shut up his Maintenon in a convent for life."

But other sorrows and humiliations were now coming upon the king. In the midst of the anxiety of the war his only son, the Dauphin of France, a man of no little force and good promise, had died of the small-pox. In less than a year, the new dauphin, the king's grandson, the Duke of Burgundy, a prince of great intelligence and pure and upright character, was carried off suddenly, by a mysterious malady which tortured him as with consuming fire. The aged monarch had gloried in the idea of having so worthy a scion as the Duke of Burgundy to succeed him on the throne of his ancient kingdom; and all France had looked forward with joy and confidence to the succeeding reign, which the advancing years of the king indicated could not be far distant. Only six days before, the young Duchess of Burgundy, the pride of the Court, the joy of the king, had died of the same mysterious malady; and, again, in a few days the eldest of the two infant sons of the late Duke of Burgundy, the new dauphin, was no more, his brother surviving, a sickly infant, who afterward is infamously known as Louis XV.

Thus three dauphins died in less than a year—the last two and the wife and mother in less than twenty-four days. These disasters culminated the woes and misfortunes of France, and bowed down the aged monarch with grief inconsolable. Instead of strengthening his royal Bourbon line through his descendants, he saw with sorrow his dynasty passing away before his eyes. To aggravate the king's grief, suspicions of poison were verified by autopsy; and popular clamor ascribed the crime to the Duke of Orleans, the king's nephew, the heir presumptive to the crown, and subsequently regent.

Marshal Villars recounts that when he called upon the king, at Marly, he burst into tears, and in a voice of heart-felt grief exclaimed: "You see the state I am in, Marshal; there are few examples of horrors such as have come upon me: of losing in the same week my grandson, his wife, and their child—all of the greatest hope and tenderly beloved. God has punished me—I have well deserved this. I will suffer less in the other world." Not long after another grandson of the king, the Duke de Berry, also perished of a malady sudden and mysterious. Poison was again suspected, but the mysterious hand that gave the cup remained unknown.

In August, 1715, the great king himself was attacked by his last malady (what is called "senile gangrene"), that caused extreme torment, amid sleepless nights and days harassed by plots for the succession between the Duke of Orleans and the king's illegitimate son, the Duke du Maine. In an address to his little great-grandson, the future king, called to his bedside, the dying monarch thus exhorted him: "My child, console your people as much as in your power, and do that which I have been unable to accomplish."

Wearied by his thoughts and depressed by the disease that was surely making its dread progress, the once proud monarch, now abased before the King of kings, exclaimed at times as he pondered upon his past career: "Oh, my God! when will you bestow the grace on me of delivering me from this miserable life? I have no restitutions to make as a private man, but as a prince. My God! I hope in your mercy—I suffer —but I do not suffer enough—and that is what afflicts me."

Louis' departure from life was characterized by decency, tranquillity, and firmness; and, it may be said, by repentance toward God and man—a repentance not infrequent when age and disease have awakened conscience, and brought home the sad lesson of human helplessness. Kings desire to leave behind them a happy memory and the love and respect of their people. But the decease of Louis XIV. caused no regret in France. All classes seemed to find relief in the cessation of this terrible reign. He left behind him trouble in the Church and a discontented parliament. The provinces were ruined; the kingdom was left overwhelmed with debt; the long wars had burdened the people with taxation; and the continuous conscription and sacrifice of life had brought sorrow to every home. "The people," says a contemporary, "thanked God for their deliverance."

His funeral dirges were the execrations and ribaldry of the mob, as his remains were carried through a by-road to St. Denis, and all France arose and breathed as if freed from the weight of an incubus. I here give a translation of one of the many epigrams that were circulated:

1715.

"If France—now that thy course is done—
Weep not, Louis, the cause is known:
Her eyes, all tears throughout thy reign,
Have no more tears to weep again."

The final scene remains to be briefly related:

Amid the storm of the Revolution in July, 1793, Barrère made a speech, urging the destruction of the tombs of royalty in St. Denis.

"These tombs under the tyrants," he said, "had flattered monarchy by their pompous descriptions, and seem, even now, to swell with a vanished grandeur. Let the hand of the Republic," he exclaimed, "destroy these proud epitaphs and sumptuous mausoleums, which recall the frightful souvenirs of royalty; and of the coffins of our old tyrants, let us make bullets to hurl them at our enemies."

The decree was carried out, the desecration made: kings

once all-powerful, queens before whose grace and beauty all had bowed, royal infants, and even saints, were thrown into two outside ditches dug for the purpose. Among the bodies thrown in the ditch was that of the Grand Monarque, whose features were still recognizable, his body black as ink.

The remains of him who had caused the bodies of guiltless men, women and children to be desecrated and thrown on highways and into sewers, now were thrown, like a dog, in a ditch, amid the jeers and derision of a mob. Time had brought its change.

Stern *Nemesis*—daughter of Night, the avenger of wrong —had brought a full retribution.

She had finished her work. There was nothing more for her to do.

MINUTES OF MEETINGS AND REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Meeting, November 15, 1888 179
Meeting, December 20, 1888 179
Meeting, January 17, 1889 180
Meeting, February 21, 1889 181
Meeting, March 21, 1889 182
Meeting, April 13, 1889 (Annual) 182
Meeting, April 18, 1889 183
Meeting, December 19, 1889 183
Meeting, March 20, 1890 183
Meeting, April 14, 1890 (Annual) 184
Meeting, April 17, 1890 184
Meeting, April 13, 1891 (Annual) 185
Report of Library Committee, 1890–91 185
Report of Ladies' Committee, 1890–91 186

MINUTES OF MEETINGS AND REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, Thursday, *November* 15, 1888, 8 P.M.

THE Society met, Hon. John Jay in the chair. The reading of the minutes of the last meeting, on motion, was dispensed with. Hon. John Jay opened the meeting by reading a short paper, after which he introduced the speaker of the evening, Prof. Henry M. Baird, of the University of New York, who read a most excellent paper on

"The Huguenots of the Désert."

Mr. Du Puy moved a vote of thanks to Prof. Baird for his excellent paper, and requested a copy for the archives of the Society—seconded by Mr. De Lancey and adopted unanimously.

Mr. Du Puy gave notice to the Society that it was proposed to change section ten of the By-Laws, to read "Shall be held on the third Thursday of each month, from November to May," instead of "the first Tuesday in each month from November to May."

Laid over till next meeting for final action.

The Society then adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, Thursday, *December* 20, 1888, 8 P.M.

The Society met, and, in the absence of the President, Mr. Du Puy, Vice-President for Pennsylvania, presided.

The reading of the minutes, on motion, was dispensed with.

The change in the By-Law proposed at the last meeting of the Society, that "the third Thursday in each month from November to May" be substituted for "the first Tuesday in each month," was laid before the Society for its action.—Adopted.

On the arrival of Mr. De Lancey, Vice-President for New York, Mr. Du Puy vacated the chair.

Mr. De Lancey, on taking the chair, introduced in a few fitting and terse remarks, Mrs. Martha J. Lamb, the speaker of the evening.

Mrs. Lamb then read a highly instructive and valuable paper on the "Career and Times of Nicholas Bayard."

Mr. Rappelya, of Mount Vernon, moved a vote of thanks to Mrs. Lamb for her paper, and that a copy should be requested for the archives of the Society. Mr. Du Puy seconded the motion, which was adopted.

The following persons were elected Members of the Society:

Miss E. C. Jay	Life Member	City.
Mr. Matthew Clarkson	Member	City.
Mrs. M. Webb-Reed	"	City.
Mr. Louis Du Bois Bech	"	City.
Mr. Jas. S. Van Cortlandt	"	Croton Landing.
Joseph Leidy, Jr., M.D.	"	Philadelphia.
Rev. M. E. Julien, D.D.	"	New Bedford.

The Society then adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, Thursday, *January* 17, 1889, 8 P.M.

The Society met, Hon. John Jay in the chair.

The reading of the minutes, on motion, was dispensed with.

Mr. Jay read a letter received from Monsieur Meille, the Vice-President of the Vaudois Society.

At its conclusion, Mr. E. F. De Lancey, Vice-President of the Society, offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*—That the Huguenot Society of America have listened with interest to the letter of Monsieur Meille, Vice-Président de la Société d'Histoire Vaudoise, and have pleasure in expressing their cordial sympathy with that society, and other bodies of the pure Christian faith, who are about to commemorate the return to their ancient homes of the heroic Waldensian exiles under the lead of Henri Arnaud, two hundred years ago."

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

Mr. Jay then presented the speaker of the evening in a few fitting phrases.

Thereupon the Rev. Benjamin F. De Costa read the following valuable historical and able paper, entitled:

"Some Events and Influences that Preceded the Establishment of the Huguenot Society in New York."

At its conclusion, Mr. Lester moved a vote of thanks to the speaker, which was adopted.

Mrs. Elizabeth Proudfit, of Morristown, N. J., was then elected a Member of the Society.

The following persons were proposed as Members:

Mrs. Jas. M. Lawton, Life Member.

Prof. Allan Marquand, Princeton, Member.

Referred to the Executive Committee.

The Society then, on motion, adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, Thursday, *February* 21, 1889, 8 P.M.

The Society met, Mr. Jay in the chair.

The reading of the minutes of last meeting, on motion, was dispensed with.

Prof. Allan Marquand was elected a Member, and Mrs. James M. Lawton, a Life Member, of the Society.

The following persons were proposed as Members of the Society, and referred to the Executive Committee:

Mr. Gustavus D. Julien.....Hoboken, N. J.
by Rev. M. C. Julien, of New Bedford.

Mr. Norman I. Rees,
Mr. Frank Rees,
Mr. Arthur F. Rees, } .....New York City.
by Prof. J. K. Rees.

Miss Jeannie Boudinot.....Bernardsville, N. J.
by Mrs. Stimson.

Mr. Isaac E. Hasbrouck..... Brooklyn.

Mr. Lawrence Turnure gave notice that he had a list of names to propose for membership, but had forgotten the list, and wished to have them considered as duly presented.

Mr. Du Puy moved that they be presented at the Executive Committee meeting on February 25, or next Monday.—Carried.

Mr. Jay then, in a few words, presented Mr. De Lancey, the Vice-President of the Society, and he forthwith read an excellent paper on "Philip Freneau, the Huguenot Patriot and Poet of the Revolution."

Mr. Rappelya moved a vote of thanks and Mr. Du Puy seconded it.—Adopted. The Society then adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON, *Secretary.*

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, Thursday, *March* 21, 1889, 8 P.M.

The Society met, Mr. Henry M. Lester in the chair. The reading of the minutes of the last meeting was dispensed with. No business was transacted, as a quorum of members was not present, the weather being exceedingly stormy. Prof. Philip Schaff, D.D., desiring to read his paper before the handful of people present, Mr. Lester presented him in a few fitting remarks. Prof. Schaff thereupon read a most valuable and interesting paper entitled:

"The Edict of Nantes compared with other Toleration Edicts."

A vote of thanks was moved at its conclusion, and a copy requested for publication. The Society then, on motion, adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

ANNUAL MEETING.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, Saturday, *April* 13, 1889.

The Society met, Mr. Jay in the chair. Twenty-two members were present. The Secretary being temporarily absent, Mr. Jay presented the Secretary's Annual Report, which was adopted and ordered on file. Mr. Gallaudet presented the Treasurer's Annual Report, and on being audited by Mr. De Peyster and Dr. De Costa, it was likewise accepted and ordered on file. Mrs. Lamb read her Report on the Library, which contains to date 662 publications. It also was duly accepted and ordered on file. The Publication Committee made no report. The Report of the Special Ladies' Committee, presented also by Mrs. Lamb, was likewise accepted and adopted. Mr. H. Le Grand Cannon reported on Seal and Diploma, and asked for further instructions. The Nominating Committee then presented its list of officers for the ensuing year—the same as last year. The Secretary was authorized to cast the ballot for the Society, which he did, and the Board of Officers were reëlected for the year 1889-90.

Miss Neely proposed the following persons for membership in the Society:

Bishop H. A. Neely ..... Portland, Me.
Miss Laura Neely ..... Claverack, N. Y.

Mr. Wm. H. Budd proposed the following gentlemen:

Mr. Jas. McLean ..... 156 Broadway.
Mr. Richard Poillon ..... 36 E. 38th St.
Mr. Peter C. Baker ..... 39 E. 38th St.

This list was duly seconded and referred to the Executive Committee for action.

The Society then, on motion, adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, Thursday, *April* 18, 1889.

The Society met, Mr. Jay, the President, in the chair. The reading of the minutes of the last meeting was dispensed with.

Prof. Chas. A. Briggs, D.D., delivered an excellent paper on

"Elias Neau."

Mr. Fernow, the State Librarian, was present. Dr. Vermilye moved a vote of thanks, and it was seconded by Mr. De Peyster, Rev. R. R. Hoes, and Dr. Vermilye in short speeches.

The Society then adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, *December* 19, 1889, 8 P.M.

The Society met, and, as Mr. Jay was unavoidably absent, Mr. E. F. De Lancey, Vice-President for New York, presided, and introduced the speaker, Mr. Edward Wakefield, an Englishman, who delivered a witty and entertaining paper entitled :

"Waifs and Strays of American History."

Mr. Pumpelly moved a vote of thanks, which was seconded by Mr. Clarkson.—Adopted.

Mrs. Lawton nominated for membership,

Mrs. James Grant Wilson .....New York,

and Miss Neely nominated,

Dr. Elizabeth Neely Bradley .....New York.

Nominations were referred to the Executive Committee for action.

The Society then adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, Thursday, *March* 20, 1890, 8 P.M.

The Society met, Hon. John Jay in the chair. The reading of the minutes of the last meeting was dispensed with.

Mr. Jay then introduced the speaker of the evening, Hon. James W. Gerard, who read an excellent paper on

"The Retribution of Louis XIV."

A vote of thanks was moved at the conclusion of the paper, and there being no further business the Society adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

ANNUAL MEETING.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, *April* 14, 1890, 4 P.M.

The Society met, Mr. De Lancey in the chair. The minutes of the last meeting were read and on motion adopted. The annual reports of the Secretary, the Treasurer, and the Library Committee were presented and adopted. The Seal and Diploma Committee and the Publication Committee presented no report.

The President, Vice-Presidents, Treasurer, and Secretary were re-elected unanimously for the ensuing year.

The following persons were elected Members of the Society:

Miss I. G. Bowdoin.....Baltimore, Md.
Mrs. A. M. Talcott.....Paterson, N. J.
Miss Ruth Lawrence.....New York City.
Mr. W. G. Dominick.....New York City.

Mr. Jay proposed Hon. Martin Brimmer, of Boston, as a Member. Adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, Thursday, *April* 17, 1890, 8 P.M.

The Society met, Mr. De Lancey in the chair. Reading of the minutes of the last meeting, on motion, was dispensed with.

Mr. Martin Brimmer, of Boston, was elected a Member of the Society.

Mr. De Lancey then introduced the speaker of the evening, General James Grant Wilson, who read an excellent paper on

"The Bayard Family of America, with Extracts from Judge Bayard's Diary of 1795–96."

Adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON.
Secretary.

Annual Meeting.

Columbia College, *April* 13, 1891.

The Huguenot Society of America held its annual business meeting for 1891, in accordance with the Constitution, on the 13th of April (the two hundred and ninety-third anniversary of the promulgation of the Edict of Nantes).

The President, the Hon. John Jay, although still lame from his serious accident in the previous fall, was able to be present, and duly presided.

Mr. Clarkson being absent, Mr. Pumpelly acted as Secretary *pro tem.*

The Society, of which there was a very fair attendance, met at 11 A.M. at Sherry's, Fifth Avenue, corner Thirty-seventh Street. The meeting being called to order, the minutes of the last meeting were read and approved.

The Secretary reported an increase in additions to the membership roll, the total now numbering some two hundred and fifty.

A copy of the new Library Catalogue, pronounced by experts one of the best ever printed, had been sent to each member and to nearly forty different Historical Societies. A List of Members, showing names of the "Emigré" of each Member so far as obtained, was in preparation.

In the absence of the Treasurer, his Annual Report was read by his assistant, the balance now standing to our credit in bank being $2,296.90.

Professor Rees read the Report of the Publication Committee, showing therein that this Society has already had printed and issued Volume I. of "Collections"; Parts I. and II. of Volume I. of "Proceedings," completing the printed record to and including the adjourned meeting of April 20, 1888; a pamphlet on the Commemoration, October 22, 1885, of the Bi-centenary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; a List of Members (1887); the Constitution of the Society; and a Catalogue of the Library. The report also showed on hand a considerable number of papers and addresses.

Mrs. Lamb read the following report of the Library Committee:

The Library of the Huguenot Society has been growing steadily during the past year under the best of care. The establishment of this Library about eight years ago was with the view to preserve and perpetuate the history and literature of the Huguenots; and since the collection was shelved in the fire-proof library of Columbia College in the spring of 1888, it has been classified with special

reference to the needs and convenience of the readers and investigators who are seeking information concerning the Huguenots, their life in France, and their emigration and various settlements, together with their extraordinary influence upon the commercial, religious and social life of the countries which afforded them refuge from persecution. Thus far the books and pamphlets of the Society have largely been gifts, although a considerable number of the most rare and costly treasures have been secured by purchase. The Library is necessarily a special collection, chiefly works of reference, and nearly all its bound volumes are from limited or privately printed editions, and it is hoped and expected to make it the best and most valuable library of its kind in the civilized world. It is accessible at all hours of the day or evening for study and reference within the spacious and convenient rooms of the Library of Columbia College, where tables are provided for the reader and the books supplied by a page. The card-catalogue is kept in the general reading-room.

Last year the Library Committee published a handsome catalogue, which has been placed in possession of every member of the Society, and which is said to bear favorable comparison, in point of style and tasteful printing, with any library catalogue of its character that has yet been produced. Since the Library came to its present home it has nearly doubled its volumes—which now, including pamphlets and manuscripts, number seven hundred and forty-two. The Library Committee has also to report the foundation of a Library Fund, through the generous gift from Mrs. James M. Lawton of $50, followed by the gift from Mrs. William A. Budd of $50, and by the farther gift from Hon. John Jay of $50, to which the Executive Committee has graciously added $100, thus making the germ of the permanent Library fund at the present time $250, the interest of which is to be devoted annually to the purchase of books. As the increase of this fund will materially add to the growth and development of the Library and to the honor of the Society, it is desirable that other Members should volunteer contributions at their pleasure, and thereby aid in this important work.

Mrs. Lamb also read the report of the Ladies' Committee :

This Committee has been in existence four years, since 1887, and has performed some very important and useful work. It was created by an action of the Society, which was communicated to the Chairman by Rev. Mr. Wittmeyer, then Secretary of the Society, in the following words: "November 1st, 1887. At a meeting of this

Society, held yesterday, the following resolution was unanimously adopted: 'Resolved, that there be appointed by the chair a committee of ladies who shall act as a committee of correspondence, whose duty it shall be to put themselves in communication with the different Huguenot centres of the country, and to further the interests of this Society in such directions as may seem to them best, and that this Committee report at the next meeting of the Society.'"

This Ladies' Committee accordingly organized itself into a "committee of correspondence," and adopted a system of work which has had for its object the awakening of an interest among all the descendants of French Protestants in this country. A circular was prepared and subsequently printed, which was sent broadcast through the land; letters were written to multitudes of persons with Huguenot names and of Huguenot ancestry, and a portfolio in which to place and preserve such responses was opened. Packages of stationery bearing the imprint of the Huguenot Society were assigned to each lady, and a vast number of names was collected whom it was thought proper to address. Some of the communications that have been received possess great interest, and as soon as enough material shall be accumulated in the portfolio, it is intended to employ a clerk to collate and prepare it for publication.

The most significant result of the work of this Committee has been the increase of membership of the Society, not less than fifty new Members having been added through its direct influence and graceful efforts.

The names of the Committee for 1891 are as follows:

Mrs. Martha J. Lamb,
Chairman.
Mrs. H. C. Stimson,
Mrs. William A. Budd,
Miss Catharine Van Rensselaer,
Keeper of the Portfolio.
Mrs. James M. Lawton,
Miss Lilian Horsford,
Miss Mary Clark, Secretary.

The Committee, consisting of Messrs. Lester, Clarkson, and Pumpelly, reported on the nomination of officers for the ensuing year, who were duly elected, as on second page of cover.

By the request of the President, the Report of the Executive Com-

mittee was then read for the information of the Society, and the following persons therein named for membership were duly elected: Mr. Alexander J. Bruen, Mrs. Robert Anderson, Mrs. J. D. Leavett, Mrs. W. B. Blackwell, Mrs. J. B. Kingsland, Mrs. Morrison R. Waite, Washington, D. C., Miss Nina Haight Piffard, 10 West 35th St., City.

The President then spoke briefly, but earnestly, upon the advisability of Members of the Society giving every assistance they could to the Publication Committee, in the work so auspiciously commenced, and that each member who had not as yet sent in his genealogical record to the Secretary should do so as soon as possible, that the latter might make a successful completion of the new Catalogue.

J. C. PUMPELLY,
Secretary pro tem.

A brilliant reception was held by the Huguenot Society of America at 404 Fifth Avenue in the afternoon of the same day, from four to six o'clock, which brought many distinguished members from other cities, and in which entertainment two hundred or more guests participated, representing the best old families of New York and the country. The Reception Committee, who wore the historic white knot of the Huguenots embellished with a marigold centre, were President John Jay, his daughter Mrs. Chapman, Edward F. De Lancey, Chauncey M. Depew, Frederick J. De Peyster, Henry G. Marquand, William M. Lawrence, Peter B. Olney, Augustus C. Gurnee, Charles Lanier, Lawrence Turnure, Rev. Henry M. Baird, Rev. A. G. Vermilye, Banyer Clarkson, Henry M. Lester, R. F. Cutting, Miss Eliza C. Jay, Mrs. H. C. Stimson, Mrs. Martha J. Lamb, Mr. George S. Bowdoin, Miss Catharine Van Rensselaer, Mrs. James M. Lawton, Mrs. William H. Budd, and Mr. J. C. Pumpelly. A more interesting occasion has rarely been chronicled in New York social life. Among the well-known clergymen present were Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., Rev. Henry Van Dyke, D.D., Rev. Dr. De Costa, Rev. C. M. Pyne, Rev. W. W. Atterbury, Rev. Dr. Charles H. Gardner, Rev. Dr. Edward O. Flagg, Rev. Dr. Henry M. Baird, Rev. Dr. Gallaudet, and Rev. Dr. Demarest.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF AMERICA

APRIL 27TH, 1891, TO MAY 23D, 1894

VOLUME II.—CONTINUED

PRINTED FOR THE SOCIETY
BY AUTHORITY OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
NEW YORK, JUNE, 1894

This volume of papers and proceedings of THE HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF AMERICA, has been printed by order of the Executive Committee, under the direction of the Publication Committee.

W. WALLACE ATTERBURY, *Chairman.*
ASHBEL G. VERMILYE.
BANYER CLARKSON.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Minutes of Proceedings..... 193

The Huguenots and the Beggars. By Rev. Paul Van Dyke..... 210

The Huguenots of Ulster County. By Rev. J. G. Van Slyke, D.D... 224

The Emblematical Flower and Distinguishing Color of the Huguenots. By Mrs. James M. Lawton..... 237

Hon. John Jay's Annual Address to the Society on April 13, 1893. 246

Elias Boudinot Reminiscence of the American Revolution. By Rev. W. W. Atterbury, D.D..... 261

The Family of Prioleau. By Prof. E. M. Gallaudet, LL.D..... 299

MINUTES OF MEETINGS AND REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

Executive Meeting, April 27, 1891 195
Society Meeting, November 19, 1891 195
Executive Meeting, November 30, 1891 196
Society Meeting, January 21, 1892 196
Executive Meeting, January 26, 1892 196
Society Meeting, March 18, 1892 197
Society Annual Meeting, April 13, 1892 197
Executive Meeting, November 29, 1892 197
Society Meeting, December 15, 1892 197
Executive Meeting, December 27, 1892 199
Executive Meeting, January 5, 1893 199
Society Meeting, March 16, 1893 199
Executive Meeting, March 27, 1893 200
Society Annual Meeting, April 13, 1893 200
Executive Meeting, April 24, 1893 205
Executive Meeting, December 18, 1893 205
Society Meeting, February 15, 1894 205
Executive Meeting, February 26, 1894 207
Society Annual Meeting, April 13, 1894 207
Executive Meeting, May 23, 1894 209

MINUTES OF MEETINGS AND REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, held April 27, 1891, the following persons were elected members of the Society :

Mrs. A. D. Juillard.....New York city.
A. D. Juillard.....New York city.
Charles Van Santvoord.....New York city.
Henry Hall.....New York city.
Miss Helen Denison White.....New York city.

Columbia College, *November* 19, 1891, 8 P.M.

The Society met, Edward F. De Lancey, Vice-President, in the chair. Reading of the minutes of the last meeting, on motion, was dispensed with. The following persons were elected members of the Society :

Mrs. H. K. Porter.....Pittsburgh, Pa.
Miss A. M. Hegeman.....Pittsburgh, Pa.
Col. R. L. Maury.....Richmond, Va.
Mrs. E. Y. Swift.....Detroit, Mich.
A. T. Douthett.....Pittsburgh, Pa.
Mrs. O. S. Teall.....New York city.
Mrs. Schuyler Merritt.....Stamford, Conn.
Miss M. A. Jackson.....New York city.
Rev. John D. Soyres.....St. John's, N. B.
Rev. W. J. Holland.....Pittsburgh, Pa.
Frederick Brokaw.....New York city.
Rev. I. P. Brokaw.....Freehold, N. J.
I. V. Brokaw.....New York city.
W. V. Brokaw.....New York city.
H. B. Dominick.....New York city.
W. M. Dubois.....White Plains, N. Y.
C. T. Van Santvoord.....New York city.

Mr. De Lancey then introduced the speaker of the evening, Mr. Edward Wakefield of England, who read a paper on "Poetry and

Prose of the Nineteenth Century." On motion of Mr. C. M. Du Puy, the thanks of the Society were extended to the speaker.

The Society then, on motion, adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, held November 30, 1891, the following persons were elected members of the Society :

Archibald Douglas.....Tarrytown, N. Y.
Mrs. J. J. Slocum.....New York city.
E. D. Delamater.....Hudson, N. Y.
F. J. Collier.....Hudson, N. Y.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, *January* 21, 1892, 8 P.M.

The Society met, with the Vice-President, Mr. De Lancey, in the chair.

The reading of the minutes was dispensed with. Prof. Paul Van Dyke, of Princeton, read a paper on "The Huguenots and the Beggars."

A vote of thanks was tendered Professor Van Dyke, and a copy of the paper requested for the archives of the Society.

On motion of Mr. Du Puy, the following resolution was adopted unanimously :

"*Resolved*—That we have learned with regret that the Hon. John Jay, President of the General Society, is unable to be present this evening ; that we tender him our condolence on the occasion of his absence ; and that we trust he will shortly be restored to his accustomed health, and the active performance of the duties of his office."

The Secretary was instructed to forward a copy of the above resolution to Mr. Jay.

The Society then, on motion, adjourned.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, held January 26, 1892, the following persons were elected members of the Society :

Mrs. James M. Buford.....Rock Island, Ill.
C. H. Buford.....Rock Island, Ill.
Isaac Irving Brokaw.....New York city.
Francis Jacob Dominick.....New York city.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, *March* 18, 1892, 8 P.M.

The Society met, the Vice-President, Mr. De Lancey, in the chair. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with. Prof. J. K. Rees, of Columbia College, delivered an informal address on "Some Results of Photography as applied to Astronomy," illustrating his subject with lantern-slides. Upon motion of Dr. Atterbury, a vote of thanks was tendered him, and the Society adjourned to partake of light refreshments.

BANYER CLARKSON,
Secretary.

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, *April* 13, 1892.

The Annual Meeting of the Huguenot Society of America was held on the two hundred and ninety-fourth anniversary of the Promulgation of the Edict of Nantes.

The President of the Society, Hon. John Jay, was in the chair.

The reports of the various committees were received and approved. Mr. Banyer Clarkson resigned his position as Secretary of the Society. The thanks of the Society were, on motion, tendered to Mr. Clarkson, for his years of unselfish and earnest work in the interest of this Society. Mr. J. C. Pumpelly was elected Secretary *pro tem.* The Society, on motion, adjourned.

J. C. PUMPELLY,
Secretary pro tem.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, held November 29, 1892, the following persons were elected members of the Society:

Mrs. Mary E. Joline.....New York city.
Miss Anne de Belleville McIlvaine.....Trenton, N. J.
Miss Maria McIlvaine.....Trenton, N. J.
William W. Heroy.....New York city.
James H. Heroy.....New York city.
Gen. John Meredith Read.....Paris, France.
Edward Elbridge Salisbury, Esq.....New Haven, Conn.

An informal meeting of the Society was held, December 15, 1892, at the residence of Mr. and Mrs. James M. Lawton, 37 Fifth Avenue, which was intended to have taken the form of a reception to the President of the Society, Hon. John Jay; but, owing to a severe illness, he was unable to be present. A letter from him, addressed to Mrs. Lawton, was read by the newly elected Secretary, Mr. William Bayard Blackwell, in which he said:

"I pray you to assure your guests of my appreciation of the honor which had been proposed for me, and of my profound regret that I am unable to meet them.

"The services which our lady members are capable of rendering to our association have been shown in the fact, noted in the last report of the London Huguenot Society, that the efforts of our Ladies' Committee of the preceding year had resulted in an increase of fifty members. Among the earnest and accomplished members of the London Society are found the honored names of the Lady Layard, the Lady Charlotte Schreiber, the Lady de Gex, and others, who represent the gentle and noble traits of the Huguenots of France and their descendants in England.

"The recent founding of a Huguenot Society in Germany under the Presidency of Dr. Henry Tollin adds another to the list of Huguenot associations with which ours in America are in sympathy, including the Huguenot Society in London, La Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, at Paris, under the presidency of the Baron de Schickler, La Société d'Histoire Vaudoise, and now Der Deutsche Hugenotten Verein.

"It is an inspiring historic memory, recalled at every meeting of Huguenot descendants, that the heroic traits of their ancestors have been transplanted and have borne fruit in every land to which they were driven, bringing, as Southey, Dr. Storrs, Bishop Potter, and other thoughtful historians never forgot, new blessings to every country where they have made their home; tried virtues, graceful industries, a chivalric tone, and a trained vitality, which told at the battle of the Boyne, and in our colonial and revolutionary history.

"Nor may it be amiss to remember, as a local incident, as we recall the respectability of older New York, that, in 1638, when this city was New Amsterdam, the Huguenot population bore so large a proportion to the Dutch that Dr. La Montagne was associated in the government with Kieft, and that the public documents were printed in Dutch and French.

"That a feeling of brotherhood and regard should exist between the various branches of Huguenot descendants throughout the world, as they cherish the memory of a common faith, common trials, and a common devotion, while natural, is touching and encouraging; and perhaps the friendships formed at such reunions as you will have to-night may be unconsciously the renewal of forgotten friendships between Huguenot ancestors in their olden homes of France."

At meetings of the Executive Committee, held December 27, 1892, and February 27, 1893, the following persons were elected members of the Society:

Miss Katharine Waldo Douglas.....Tarrytown, N. Y.
Mrs. Virginia Christie Huidekoper.....Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Lydia Jones Earle.....New York city.
Ferdinand Pinney Earle.....New York city.

At a special meeting of the Executive Committee, January 5, 1893, called in view of the death of Mrs. Lamb, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"That this Committee most deeply feels the sudden and grievous loss sustained by the Huguenot Society of America in the unexpected death of one of its most esteemed, active, and energetic members, the late Mrs. Martha J. Lamb, who passed from earth in this city, on the 2d day of January, 1893.

"That this Committee itself more especially grieves for the death of its fellow-member, who was ever most efficient in her services, regular in attendance on its meetings, and prudent, wise, and courteous in her advice and suggestions.

"That never did her unusually fine qualities of head and heart appear to greater advantage than at the last stated meeting of this committee, on the afternoon of the 27th day of December, 1892—six days before her death—at which she was not only present, but took a leading part in promoting measures for the prosperity of the Society and its active work during the coming year. As gentle, refined, and retiring as she was brilliant and intellectual, she will ever remain a model for those of her sex who shall enter the paths of literature."

SHERRY'S, FIFTH AVE. AND THIRTY-SEVENTH ST., *March* 16, 1893.

The Society met at Sherry's, the Vice-President, Mr. De Lancey, in the chair. The reading of the minutes was dispensed with. Mr. De Lancey introduced the Rev. Dr. Van Slyke, who read a paper on "The Huguenots of Wallkill Valley and Ulster County." The Secretary moved that the Society extend to Dr. Van Slyke its thanks for his interesting paper. The motion was seconded by Dr. Vermilye, and after short speeches by Dr. Vermilye, Dr. Atterbury, Dr. De Costa, and Mr. Pumpelly, the motion was adopted.

The Society adjourned for supper.

WM. BAYARD BLACKWELL,
Secretary.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, held March 27, 1893, the following persons were elected members of the Society :

Hon. Abram S. Hewitt.....New York city.
Theodore Gaillard Thomas, M.D.....New York city.
William Jay Schieffelin.....New York city.
Lea McIlvaine Luquer.....New York city.

SHERRY'S, FIFTH AVE. AND THIRTY-SEVENTH ST., *April* 13, 1893.

The Society held its annual business meeting on the two hundred and ninety-fifth anniversary of the "Edict of Nantes," at 8.30 P.M.

The President, the Hon. John Jay, and the Vice-President for New York, Mr. De Lancey, both being absent on account of sickness, the Rev. Dr. W. Wallace Atterbury was called to the chair. The reading of the minutes of the last Annual Meeting was dispensed with. In the absence of the President, Mr. Jay, an address by him was read by the Secretary. Mr. Jay also sent a communication in which he said that, in accordance with the request of the Executive Committee, he had appointed a special committee to propose measures for enlarging the usefulness of the Society, which would report this evening.

The Library Committee reported the addition of forty-three volumes to the Library by the legacy of the late Mrs. Martha J. Lamb.

The Treasurer, Mr. Gallaudet, reported :

Balance on hand April 13, 1892	$1,942 05
Since received	750 00
Expenditures for the year	241 94
Balance now on hand	2,453 08

The report was referred for audit to Messrs. Pumpelly and Clarkson, and on their motion it was approved and ordered on file.

The Publication Committee reported that there had been received during the year the manuscript of Dr. Van Slyke's address on the Huguenots of Ulster County, which would be printed in the next volume of Proceedings of the Society ; and that a manuscript by Judge Clearwater had been ordered by the Executive Committee to be published in the next volume of the Collections of the Society. The Secretary presented his annual report. Mr. Sanger and Mr. Dusenbury, appointed a Committee to nominate officers of the Society, recommended the reëlection of the previous officers. Their report was

adopted, and by unanimous vote the Secretary was instructed to cast the vote of the Society for all the previous officers. Mr. Henry G. Marquand read the report of the Special Committee appointed by Mr. Jay, as follows :

Report.

The committee to which it was referred to "consider and suggest measures for increasing the usefulness and widening the influence" of the Huguenot Society of America submits the following :

The Society was founded in New York in 1883, and now has about three hundred members. It has published several volumes of its Proceedings and papers, and one elaborate volume of the records of the old Huguenot Church of New York. Columbia College has courteously given place, in her fireproof building, to the books and manuscripts of the Society, and the use of a room for its meetings, so that the Society has a home in this venerable institution, which numbers eminent Huguenots among her sons.

The object of the Society is to perpetuate the memory and promote the principles and virtues of the Huguenots; to commemorate the principal events in their history; to gather a library of all obtainable books, monographs, pamphlets, manuscripts, church and other registers relating to the Huguenots; to cause to be prepared and read before the Society papers and essays on questions of Huguenot history and genealogy, their settlements, public acts, influence on society, art, commerce, and politics of America and of other countries where they settled; and to cause to be prepared and published, when requisite materials have been from time to time found, a series of volumes, entitled "Collections of the Huguenot Society of America."

A further object is to establish branch societies in other American cities and to encourage the formation of similar societies in other countries where the Huguenots have taken refuge, in order to arrive, with their aid, at a correct estimate of the combined influence of the Huguenots upon the history of the world.

The membership of the Society embraces descendants both in the male and female lines of Huguenot families that emigrated to America prior to the proclamation of the Edict of Toleration, November 28, 1787, with other representatives of French families of the Protestant faith, and writers, of whatever nationality, who have made Huguenot history a special subject of study and remark.

The Formation of Sister Societies in England and Germany.— The establishment of the Huguenot Society of America in 1883 was soon followed by the organization of the Huguenot Society of London, with similar objects, under the presidency of the distinguished explorer and diplomat, the Right Honorable Sir Henry Austin Layard. The London society, with a large and influential list of Fellows, includes, like that of America, lady members. It has published a catalogue of its library, in addition to a number of Huguenot records in England embodying important materials for history, and at times throwing light on the emigration to America, and issues quarterly a volume of valuable and instructive papers. The relations of the two societies are most cordial and friendly.

During the last year a Huguenot Society has been established in Germany, of which the eminent Dr. Henry Tollin is president. Among the other foreign societies with which that of America is in correspondence are the French Society of Protestant History, under the presidency of the distinguished scholar, Baron Schickler; and the Historic Association of the Vaudois.

The formation of the Huguenot societies of London and Germany on the lines of the Society of America has seemed to give to our Huguenot Society a broader and deeper scope.

Historians, not of Huguenot descent, have been among the first to recognize the historic fact that when the Huguenots ceased to exist in France as a power, and were driven with unparalleled hardships from their homes, humiliated and beggared as they seemed to be, they became a source of living energy in every country to which they came. They possessed an heroic devotion to duty, a singular wisdom in politics, gentle manners, and remarkable skill in art, manufactures, and commerce. Writers, not Huguenots, bear loving tributes to the ennobling and happy influence of those who were early known in England as "the gentle and profitable strangers."

Southey said: "Wherever the refugees from the French persecution fled, a blessing followed them."

Dr. Storrs, in his memorial address on "The Early American Spirit," before the New York Historical Society, alluded to the vivid and peaceful force which the Huguenots brought from France, and said: "Whenever the history of those who came hither from La Rochelle and the banks of the Garonne is fully written, the value and vigor of the force which they imparted to the early American public life will need no demonstration."

Professor Henry M. Baird, an authority in Huguenot history, in speaking of the Huguenot influence, says : "I have somewhere seen it likened to the gold which the pious Russians cast into the molten mass that was to become the great bell of the Cathedral of Moscow ; what the Huguenots added to our American Commonwealth did not greatly augment its bulk, nor, possibly, make any essential change in its leading characteristics, but it requires no extraordinary keenness to detect the superior fineness of tone, the clearer and more melodious ring, which the admixture imparted."

The position of the Huguenot Society of America, as the leader in a general movement in the collection of material for Huguenot history, naturally suggests the question : What steps can be taken to enable the Society to meet promptly and effectively the interesting work thus devolving upon it? In answer to this question and as indicating the measures most necessary to increase the usefulness and widen the influence of the Society, the committee makes the following suggestions :

An Increase of Members.—Additional members would add to the general influence, the financial strength of the Society, and its working material; a judicious correspondence, extending throughout the Republic, and securing a general list of citizens of Huguenot descent, supplemented by a regular issue of the Proceedings and documents of the Society, would enlarge its membership and its funds.

An increase of members will also help to assure additional Huguenot genealogies, local sketches, biographies, Huguenot records from churches and courts, and will aid in procuring from Huguenot students elaborate historical papers ; a new class of corresponding members, free from dues, and entitled to the publications of the Society, might be formed from contributors to its important papers.

The Preparation of a Catalogue of all books, pamphlets, publications, and papers relative to the Huguenots, that have been heretofore published in America. Such a compilation, while requiring some time and labor, would doubtless prove to be of great value in itself in assisting future researches, and such a catalogue could, perhaps, nowhere be made more completely than in the libraries of New York.

A Paid Assistant Secretary.—The work of the Society, including correspondence, will make it necessary for the Secretary to have a paid assistant, who might be an historic student, familiar with French and German. For such work a moderate salary would suffice.

A Room for the Society.—The Society should hire a room and have it furnished with portraits and engravings of distinguished Huguenots of all countries. Such reminders of the personal worth and public services of our ancestry would undoubtedly form an interesting feature which would be appreciated by the Society, and this collection would probably be increased by contributions from individual members.

A publication fund should be formed, sufficient to issue a semi-annual volume of papers, under the auspices of the Committee on Publications, and every effort should be made to secure the publication of all Huguenot papers or records of historic value.

The committee thinks that if the foregoing suggestions are carried out, it will insure the inauguration of a new era in the growth and development of the Society and its work.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry G. Marquand, *Chairman.*	Le Grand B. Cannon,
T. Gaillard Thomas,	Chauncey M. Depew,
Charles Lanier,	Abram S. Hewitt,
W. Bayard Cutting,	Prof. J. K. Rees,
Wm. Cary Sanger,	Lawrence Turnure,
Fred J. de Peyster,	Wm. Jay Schieffelin,
Pierre Lorillard,	Lea McI. Luquer,
	Prof. Allan Marquand.

M. Frederick Necker, of Geneva, Switzerland, was introduced by the chairman, and briefly addressed the Society in French. He gave an interesting account of a correspondence which began in 1764, between Voltaire and the speaker's great-grandfather, M. Necker de Germany (this last name being the title of a "seigneuria" which he owned in the Canton de Vaud), eldest brother of the celebrated Necker, Minister of Finance to Louis XVI. This M. Necker had sought and obtained Voltaire's influence for the release of a certain Huguenot condemned to the galleys for his religion. Thereupon Necker appealed to Voltaire in favor of some fifty or sixty other Huguenots similarly condemned, to which Voltaire replied that he was not like the saint who every day released a soul from purgatory, and suggested that the persons concerned should go to Cayenne, where they would have all liberty to sing the psalms of Marot. Voltaire's part of the correspondence had recently been printed for the first time by the Archæological Society of Geneva, and M. Necker would be happy to present a copy to the Huguenot Society. He thanked the chairman and members for

their courteous welcome, and closed with a few words in behalf of the churches in France—the direct descendants of the old Huguenot churches—in whose behalf he was visiting the United States.

Mrs. James M. Lawton then read a paper, entitled "Why the Marigold should be the Emblematic Flower of the Huguenot Society."

On motion, the thanks of the Society were tendered to Mrs. Lawton for her interesting paper, and she was asked to furnish a copy of it for publication.

Adjourned for an informal reception and supper.

WM. BAYARD BLACKWELL,
Secretary.

At meetings of the Executive Committee held April 24, 1893, May 29, 1893, November 9, 1893, the following persons were elected members of the Society:

Charles H. Murray, life member.....New York city.
Henry Milton Requa.....New York city.
Alexander Dominick .....New York city.
Paul Allen, M.D.....New York city.

At a meeting of the Executive Committee, December 18, 1893, the following persons were elected members:

Frank Manley Bonta.....Syracuse, N. Y.
William Graham Bowdoin.....Baltimore, Md.
Lieut. S. S. L'H. Slocum..... Fort Meade, So. Dak.
Miss Mary Desha..... .....Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Harriet Van Rensselaer Crosby .....New York city.
Miss Maria Duane Bleecker Miller..... .... New York city.

ASSEMBLY HALL, UNITED CHARITIES BUILDING,
February 15, 1894, 8 P.M.

The Society convened in Annual Meeting, the Vice-President, Mr. De Lancey, in the chair. The minutes of the meeting of April 13, 1893, were read and approved.

Mr. De Lancey then introduced the speaker of the evening, the Rev. Dr. W. Wallace Atterbury, who read a paper on "Elias Boudinot and Incidents of the Revolution." At the conclusion of the reading, and after Mr. De Lancey had made a few remarks upon points of interest suggested by the paper, on motion of Mr. Rapelye, a vote of thanks

to Dr. Atterbury was passed, and the Society then adjourned to its room.

On coming to order again, a bronze statuette of Admiral de Coligny was presented to the Society on behalf of the Ladies' Committee by Mrs. Florence Bissell Teall. She said :

Mr. President and Members of the Huguenot Society of America :

One of the pleasant features of our meeting to-night lies in the fact that this Society is to receive, through the Ladies' Committee and other contributors, a statuette, not only perfect in itself as a work of art, but beautiful also as a memorial of one who stands now, and for all time, as the highest type of loyalty, courage, and truth : I refer to Gaspard de Coligny, after the death of Condé, *chief* of the Huguenots.

We all know his story with its tragic yet noble end.

Through all, one point surely stands out preëminent—his *enduring steadfastness amid constant temptation.*

In rank the third greatest noble of France, he had all to lose and nothing to gain by siding with the Huguenots.

For *them* he ever toiled and cared ; for *them* he sought a refuge in the new Western World, sending out two expeditions to Florida, rendered futile through Spanish cruelty and greed.

"He organized the reform and disciplined the reformers ;" and at last fought for the cause, fighting so well that the Catholics themselves grew anxious for peace.

Vainly had the Guises tried to tempt him ; vain were the allurements of the Medici. True to his belief and to his duty, he remained firm in spite of all.

They could not bribe him, so they killed him !

A martyr to his faith, he died alone—"*mais environné de soixante ans de gloire !*"

His memory lives immortal in all of Huguenot blood.

"On all who bear
Their name and lineage, may their mantle rest.
That firmness for the truth ; that calm content
With simple pleasures ; that unswerving trust
In toil, adversity, and death, which cast
Such *healthful* leaven 'mid the elements
That peopled the New World."

To us Coligny forever stands, the "Bayard of the Reformation"—*sans peur et sans reproche.*

Mr. President and Members of the Huguenot Society of America: at the request of the chairman of the Ladies' Committee, Mrs. Lawton, I now present to you this statuette of Gaspard de Coligny.

The chairman, on behalf of the Society, with an appropriate response, gratefully accepted the gift of the ladies. On motion, the thanks of the Society were extended to the generous contributors.

On motion, it was voted that the Marigold be accepted as the emblematic flower of the Society, and that a white ribbon with a border of a single thread of red, white, and blue be the Huguenot ribbon.

The Society then adjourned.

WM. BAYARD BLACKWELL,
Secretary.

At meetings of the Executive Committee, held February 26, 1894, and March 26, 1894, the following persons were elected members of the Society:

Cortlandt Schuyler Van Rensselaer	New York city.
James Wilson Clark	New York city.
Thos. J. Oakley Rhinelander	New York city.
James Bayard Henry	Germantown, Pa.
Daniel Requa Foster	Trenton, N. J.
Henry Graff Trevor	New York city.
Mrs. Howard Townsend	New York city.
Mrs. Schuyler Hamilton, Jr	New York city.
Mrs. Wm. E. D. Scott	New York city.
Lewis Boudinot Atterbury	New York city.
Rev. Henry A. Stimson, D.D	New York city.
Isaac Myer	New York city.
Miss Sarah Devotion	New York city.
Christopher Rhinelander Robert	Oakdale, Long Island.

ASSEMBLY HALL, UNITED CHARITIES BUILDING,
April 13, 1894, 8.30. P. M.

The Annual Meeting of the Society was held, at which, in the absence of the President, Mr. De Lancey, the Vice-President for New York, occupied the chair. The minutes of the last Annual Meeting and of the meeting of February 15, 1894, were read and approved.

The Treasurer, Mr. Gallaudet, presented his report for the year, which, on motion, was referred for audit to the Finance Committee.

The Secretary read his report for the year, which was accepted and ordered on file.

Reports were also presented and ordered on file from the Publication and Library Committees.

The following officers for the ensuing year having been nominated by the Executive Committee, were, on motion, unanimously elected, and the Secretary was ordered to cast the vote of the Society for them, which having been done, their names were announced as follows :

Honorary President.....Hon. John Jay.
President.....Henry G. Marquand.
Vice-President for New York.....Prof. John K. Rees.
Vice-President for Staten Island.....Wm. Carey Sanger.
Vice-President for Boston.....Hon. Robert C. Winthrop.
Vice-President for New Oxford.....Hon. Richard Olney.
Vice-President for Pennsylvania.....Chas. M. Du Puy.
Vice-President for New Jersey.....Rev. D. D. Demarest, D.D.
Vice-President for South Carolina.....Daniel Ravenel.
Vice-President for Delaware.....Hon. Thomas F. Bayard.
Vice-President for New Rochelle.....Henry M. Lester.
Vice-President for New Paltz.....Hon. A. T. Clearwater.
Vice-President for Narragansett.....William Ely.
Vice-President for Virginia.....Richard L. Maury.

Secretary.....William Bayard Blackwell.
Treasurer.....Henry M. Lester.

On motion, the thanks of the Society were extended to Mr. De Lancey, the retiring Vice-President for New York, and Mr. Gallaudet, the retiring Treasurer, for their long and faithful services.

The chair was then taken by the newly elected President, Mr. Henry G. Marquand, who, in a brief, appropriate address, expressed his warm interest in the Society, and his purpose to do whatever he could to promote its interests.

The chairman then introduced E. M. Gallaudet, LL.D., President of the National College for the Deaf at Washington, D. C., who read a paper on "The Prioleau Family in Italy, France, and America." At its close, on motion of Dr. Atterbury, the thanks of the Society were

extended to Professor Gallaudet for his very interesting and instructive paper.

The Society then adjourned for an informal reception, with refreshments, in its rooms.

WM. BAYARD BLACKWELL,
Secretary.

At an Executive Committee meeting, held on May 23, 1894, Mr. H. G. Marquand presented the following minute on the death of Mr. Jay, which was unanimously adopted, and a copy directed to be sent to his family:

"Few names in the history of this country, since the establishment of our national independence, are more brilliant and closely associated with all that is useful to make good citizenship than the name of Jay. Inspired by high purposes, and laboring for the truest interest of the Republic, the late John Jay became one of the founders of the Huguenot Society of America, the intention of which was to perpetuate the virtues and promote the principles of the Huguenots.

"He was elected unanimously the first President of the Society in 1883, and was reëlected in successive terms until his death. He lived to see a good beginning of this effort, and in imitation of this enterprise other societies have been started in London and in Boston. His attention to the interests of the American Society was thorough, and continued to his latest moments. The Society, wishing to record more fully his labors, will have prepared during the year a history of his connection with its work, and in the mean time now place on their record that it is with deep sorrow they learn of his death, and they tender to his family their sympathies and highest regards."

Mr. Blackwell having tendered his resignation as Secretary, in view of his ill-health and intended absence from the city, Mr. Lea McIlvaine Luquer was unanimously elected Secretary in his place.

The following persons were elected members of the Society:

William Sinclair Bacot.....East Orange, N. J.
Mrs. Elbert Floyd-Jones.....New York city.
Mrs. Charles S. Sargent.....Brookline, Mass.
Miss Marian Neale Bayard Cooper.....Bloomfield, N. J.

THE HUGUENOTS AND THE BEGGARS.*

By Prof. Paul Van Dyke, Princeton, N. J.

The Reformation was not a sudden disturbance spreading from a centre in ever-widening circles. It was a general movement of the human soul, finding expression in different localities and varying into diverse forms.

These may be classified under three heads: Radical Reform, National Reform, Imperial or Catholic Reform.

The Radical Reform embraces all those movements which, like Socinianism, broke with the dogma of the Church, or, like the Anabaptists, with dogma, the ideal of religion and the politico-religious ideal of society. The National Reform embraces those movements which did not break with dogma, or the politico-religious idea of society, but with certain ideals of religion as expressed in organization, traditions, and cult. The Imperial or Catholic Reform has its centre in the Oratory of Divine Love, and its characteristic moments of expression in the Council of Trent and the Society of Jesus.

The history of Europe from 1500 to 1650 is the history of this movement and the conflicts of its types.

If this seem to any a strange way of looking at the history of this period, I think the explanation is to be found in certain methods of presentation, which are both helpful and harmful to the understanding of history.

For example, there is the method which presents it as a series of biographies. The better these are done the more apt are they to make us forget that the history of an epoch is the sum of the biographies of all who have lived in it.

There is also the influence of historical painting—I mean what might be called the historical painting of commerce. Nowadays this usually assumes a high degree of reality. But it bears about the same relation to history that some of the scenes in Charles Dickens's novels do to life—both ought to

* Read before the Huguenot Society, January 21st, 1892.

be lighted by footlights, and looked at through a lorgnette. Indeed, this is the way in which historical painting is usually auctioned off for its market price.

Such influences as these are apt to make us forget that history, which may be presented as a drama, must be studied as a science. The objects of the historian's search are the secret forces which produce universal movements.

The National Reform found simultaneous expression at three points, Germany, France, and Switzerland. In December, 1520, Luther burned the papal bull at Wittenberg. In 1521 Zwingli resigned his papal pension, and Farel began to preach justification by faith at Meaux.

These men proclaimed the personality of religion, but we shall be much misled if we consider that they meant to assert simply a spiritual religion—a religion without visible expression in an institution. They all believed in a church, and in a church which was an organic part of civil society. For European civilization was moulded by an ideal which had regarded church and state as two sides of the same thing. Voluntary membership of the church was foreign to contemporary methods of thought. It seemed a subversion of the foundations of organized society. Those Anabaptists who asserted it were slaughtered by both parties as foes to God and man. Hence, all the leading reformers of the National and Catholic types believed persecution a necessity and a duty.

Now, if the reformers turned from the Catholic Church, whose ideal had been the old *imperium*, standing for civil unity, there was nothing to turn to but the idea of nationality, which had loosed the bonds of the old *imperium*. So they preached a German church, a Swiss church, a French church, freed from what they thought the tyranny of the Roman ecclesiastical *imperium*.

The natural supporter of the papacy in this struggle with rebellious children was the institution whose interests were opposed to the national spirit to which it appealed—the empire. It was the empire, therefore, which, in 1521, declared Luther, the protagonist of National Reform, an outcast from society, an outlaw. Thus began four generations of war, in

which the National Reform fought for its existence first against the empire and then against the Catholic Reform. This long strife had three stages, the first of which ended in 1555 with the Peace of Augsburg. Thanks to the conflicts of the empire with the pope, France, and the Turk, the German National Reform then achieved toleration. And Charles V., broken in body by labor and excess, in spirit by the failure of his ambitions, abdicated in favor of his son Philip.

The second and sterner phase of the war against the National Reform was to begin. Its protagonist on the traditional side was no longer the empire, but the Catholic Reform.

The Catholic Reform had become conscious of itself, and fixed its programme. It had united under its lead all the various parties who believed in the old Church, and presented one front to the common foe, now divided into jealous and hostile factions. It had found in Loyola a leader, who, for force and enthusiasm, was equal to any man of his century. He had seized the truths of the personality and reality of religion, and consecrated them to the service of the institutional Christianity of tradition.

The Catholic Reform had elected its ablest ecclesiastic, Caraffa, to the papacy, and the successor of Saint Peter once more aspired to be, not simply an Italian prince, but the spiritual head of Christendom.

The passionate caprice of Caraffa had for the moment broken the papacy from its ablest ally. But the breach was only temporary. Spain had given the Church the hero of its revival; common worldly interests and common sincerity of faith would make "His Most Catholic Majesty" champion the Church Spain had done most to revive. Already the Spanish nobility had developed that curious pride of orthodoxy which made heresy appear like cowardice—a stain on personal and family honor.

Philip II., the king of this nation, might well seem invincible. He was King of Naples, Sicily, Spain, husband of the Queen of England, ruler of Milan and the Netherlands, and owner of half America. The chief manufactures of the Old World were his. The mines of the New World sent him gold.

Italy furnished generals, and Spain gave him soldiers for those regiments that were not beaten in equal fight for more than a century.

Freed from the useless encumbrance of the imperial crown, Spain might aspire to create a real empire which should pale that shadowy memento of an outworn power. An emperor might again rule the world with the blessing of the pope.

The National Reform needed a new protagonist. It found it in the French type, which, banished from France, had absorbed the Swiss reform.

This French type was to be accepted by a portion of all the nations occupying the northwest of Europe within the sector of a circle roughly indicated by the lines of the Pyrenees, the Alps, the Atlantic, and Northern Ocean. The centre of radiation of this type was Geneva, situated at the angle of the sector. The man who gave it form was John Calvin.

Calvin was a Frenchman, not only by birth, but also by the qualities of his genius He possessed that power of critical analysis and that sense of form which are apparent in the most characteristic product of the French, their prose, of which Calvin was the father.

If it seems strange to any of you who remember such things as Taine's criticism of Milton to speak of Calvin's genius as characteristically French, pray remember that the French nation was by the emigration artificially deprived of certain of its original constituent elements.

Calvin was a smaller man than Luther, but he possessed a certain power and a certain quality which Luther lacked. He had the power of organization. Luther could make a protest sound through the world—Luther could preach—Luther could sing—Luther could give a German tongue to Matthew and Paul and John; but when confronted with the task of constituting a church, Luther was helpless. The German national church never received a form. It simply drifted into a chaotic dependence on the state.

But a still greater difference between them was Calvin's quality of broader human sympathy. Calvin burned Servetus, for, like all leaders of the National and Catholic Reform, he

believed in the duty of persecution. But Calvin would never, like Luther, have instigated and applauded the awful massacre of the helpless peasants at the close of the Peasant War. This was not an intellectual mistake of Luther's. It was the unconscious aversion of the son of a bauer, who had become a burgher, for the class from which he had emerged. Luther walked with God, but even the divine conversation seems sometimes unable to enlarge the horizon of human sympathies beyond the limits of inherited prejudices.

Calvin's absolutism was imposed on his feeling by his logic. Luther's was that sentimental absolutism which precludes even the instruction of experience. Therefore Lutheranism, like Anglicanism and Catholicism, has in modern history stood by absolutism under the formula of the "Throne and the Altar." Calvinism, under the formula of "God and Freedom," has joined hands with popular sovereignty.*

Neither Lutheranism nor Zwinglianism could ever maintain a propaganda. But Calvinism, feeling by instinct its election as the protagonist of a great struggle, girded itself for its destiny.

From 1555 to 1564 one hundred and fifty pastors left Geneva for France, while a steady stream of laymen and preachers from the Netherlands, the Rhine lands, Poland, Bohemia, and England kept going to Geneva as pupils and leaving it as partisans.

The success of these missionaries in France and the Netherlands was great. And they carried not only doctrine, but the ideas for an organization, republican, strong, and flexible. It was to prove admirably adapted to spread and maintain itself secretly in time of peace, to strike suddenly and forcibly in time of war.

What has been called by their most elegant and perspicuous historian—a member, I believe, of this society—"the rise of the Huguenots" (the *nom de guerre* of the French Calvinists) precedes the rise of the Beggars (the fighting name of the Dutch Calvinists).

---

* The action of Scotland during the commonwealth, and certain other episodes, must be excepted from this statement.

By 1559 the French Calvinist church was an organized religious republic, with local administrative centres and a governing national council, and it seems most probable that it was this imitation of the hated Swiss republicanism which gave to them the name of Huguenots, equivalent to *Eidgenossen*. The Calvinists of Holland received somewhat later a similar organization.

The French Calvinists needed organization, for they had against them not only the general opposition of feeling and law, finding expression in mobs and executions for heresy, but also the active personal enmity of the great family of Guise.

There are two opinions about this family, that of Protestant and Catholic historians. They are well represented by the following contemporary satiric verses:

LORRAINE—GUISE CHIEF MEMBERS.

His Grace of Lorraine is the Saint of France,
He spares no pain the faith to advance,
He fills his purse to help the poor,
France will grow worse when he is no more.

There is another who stands for the realm,
The Cardinal's brother holds the state's helm.
May God's curse seize all who would harm
The Duke of Guise, our king's right arm.

Now, this precious pair are the land's best stay,
They use every care our strifes to allay,
And miss not a hope our sufferings to heal,
They will do anything each ever aspires.

Guise wants to be king of all loyal hearts,
His brother the pope cannot match in his zeal.

If you read this poem in the regular manner you have the usual view of the Roman Catholic historian, who regards the members of this family as impersonations of faith and loyalty. If one wants the usual view of the Protestant historian, who regards this family as lineally descended from Satan, all one has to do is to cut the lines in half longitudinally and take the

first half as a complete verse. For our purpose it is not necessary to decide between them; suffice it to point out that the Guises were hated by the native nobility as foreigners; they were feared by the Huguenots as leagued with Spain to destroy the Reformed religion.

In the Netherlands also, it was foreign oppression which was feared—Spanish troops, Spanish governors, the Spanish Inquisition. Behind the danger which threatened both French and Dutch Calvinism was the same ominous figure, Philip of Spain, whose sincere bigotry and unvarying tyranny were the twin expressions of a cold and vulgar egotism for which nothing seemed too small or too great.

These two secret religious republics knew that republics do not fight well except under a dictator, and they found for their protectors two of the most remarkable men of modern times, Gaspard de Coligny and William of Orange.

Between their careers and characters there are some remarkable similarities. Both were men of royal descent and great wealth. Both had a joyous youth filled with energy and pleasure. Coligny has left legends of his student days at Paris, which show him, with D'Audelot and the young Guise, as a leader in student life, distinguished for riding the wildest horses, good fencing, and tennis. And there has survived a curiously modern letter of Orange to his favorite brother, in which he ends a complaint about the times by saying he has no decent company, and wishing Louis were present to go hawking with him and play tennis. For both of these men found their most faithful friends and supporters in their brothers—faithful to death; for of the eight male members of the houses of Chatillon and Nassau, all but one gave their lives for the cause, and he paid the debt by sending his three sons to die in battle.

Both carried out of their youth a taste for magnificence of life. Coligny, who had learned of Berault, one of the most distinguished humanists of the circle of Erasmus, filled Chatillon with works of art and entertained sumptuously. And before William stripped his palaces to pay German mercenaries who would not fight, his banquets were known by reputation

to all the *bon vivants* of Europe. We even find King Philip writing to know if he can recommend a cook.

Under the weight of care and sorrow both grew out of this brightness and magnificence of youth to a resolute and almost sombre gravity, though the epithet of "*Tacitum*" applies better to the slow-speaking Admiral than to William, who was perhaps the most effective orator of his day. Both were constantly defeated in battle; but both managed to sustain a falling cause, which, ever ready to sink, somehow rose stronger after every defeat.

Each was the soul of his party, for, whoever may have borne the title, the great Huguenot was always the Admiral, and Le Grand Gueux was he who wore the medal for the last time at the dinner in Delft from which he stepped to death. Both gave to their countries family, possessions, and life; and both have been accused of traitorous ambition.

In the year 1562 Calvinism was well prepared for a desperate struggle. Coligny, converted by the influence of his brother and the leisure of two years of captivity, had openly avowed his adhesion to the Reform. Orange, still a Roman Catholic, had listened with disgust to the French king's betrayal of Philip's plan to send the Inquisition to the Netherlands, and, behind set lips, sworn in his soul to oppose it. The affair of Vassy provoked the storm. The Huguenots rose, and the ninety years' conflict of Calvinism and Catholicism began.

This long war was provoked by a terrible persecution. It was marked by great cruelty and rapine on both sides, and the French conflict with which it opened was no exception. Its character is indicated by the fact that of the eight chief leaders on both sides, seven perished by assassination; and it was charged (though probably falsely) that the eighth was shot in cold blood, after surrender.

But once begun, the war had to be fought to a settled peace. And so Coligny, who, like Orange, opposed its beginning, like Orange, always refused any compromise short of the legal establishment of Calvinism under proper guarantees.

There is reason to believe that the judgment of the Vene-

tian ambassador was correct—the rising of the Huguenots prevented France from becoming a Reformed country. The blood of the martyrs, not the blood of the battlefield, is the seed of the church. War has sometimes saved liberty. It has never promoted religion.

The first service which Orange rendered to the Huguenots was to oppose in the Royal Council of the Netherlands the despatch of troops to aid the French king against them; not that he yet sympathized with the Huguenot struggle, for in 1565 he wrote to Louis: "The trouble in France is nothing but jealousy between the noble families. They are not seeking anything except how they can hit each other over the head." It was not until later that he came to know Coligny better.

There has survived, under date of 1568 (the year when Orange appeared in armed revolt), the sketch of a bond between Condé, Coligny, and Orange, in which they engage themselves as princes and as true men to oppose the perfidious councillors by whom their sovereigns are losing the affections of their kingdoms, to resist that tyranny which tends to the extermination of the true religion, and to stand for the glory of God, the profit of their kings, the public good, and the liberty of religion. So in the summer of 1569 we find Orange and his brother Louis, their own armies defeated, in the Huguenot camp to fight for the common cause and lay plans for future struggles. They found there the old foe. For Spanish troops turned many battles against the Huguenots.

In a few months Orange started on a perilous ride back to Germany. But he left his brother, and he took with him an idea. His brother did great service. He saved the disastrous battle of Moncontour from utter rout by a skilful charge and retreat, and so endeared himself to the Huguenots that, when Coligny seemed to be dying, they were ready to elect Louis to succeed him.

The idea which Orange took back was even more useful than the brother he left behind. It was nothing more or less than the organization of the Beggar fleet. From the very beginning of the war, privateers, under commissions from the

Huguenots, had scoured the seas, and since 1568 Coligny had organized them into a fleet, commanded by an admiral and regulated by fixed rules.

Orange may have issued a few scattered commissions before his departure for France, but after his return he *organized* that famous fleet which turned the scale in the last conflict. And the plan of organization and rules for discipline were borrowed from Coligny.

It is an interesting fact that Coligny seems from the first to have determined to make his office of Admiral of France something more than a Swiss admiralty. He conceived the project of a great colonial empire, not as conquests, to mine gold by slaves, but as settlements. This project floated before his mind as a last refuge for the Huguenots, and after his death we see Orange thinking of firing the Dutch cities, embarking their population on the Beggar fleet, and sailing for new homes as a last stroke against unequal fate.

Suppose the flower of the Huguenots under the lead of Coligny settling in Palestine; suppose they had prepared there a refuge whither the *émigrés*, who made the prosperity of Berlin, might have fled; suppose the strength and courage of Holland under the lead of Orange had preceded by forty years the settlement of New York, and thus transferred to the New World the activity which founded the commercial supremacy of London: what a field these suppositions open for historical day-dreaming!

When the death of Condé at the battle of Jarnac left Coligny sole leader of the Huguenots, his genius both for war and peace shone resplendent. The campaign by which, without fighting a pitched battle, he made a beaten army superior to its victors, was followed by an amazing display of personal influence, by which the hated Huguenot became the most trusted councillor of the foolish young king. And it is precisely at this crisis that the unity of the Huguenots and the Beggars, the organic nature of the struggle of which these separate wars were merely phases, becomes most apparent.

The mediator between Coligny and Charles was Louis of Nassau. The motive of mediation was the plan to make

France as a neutral country the head of a great league against Spain, humiliating the hereditary foe, consolidating and extending her own power by guaranteeing the mutual toleration of Catholic and Calvinist.

Into this great league of revolted Holland and the North Provinces, the Huguenots, France, and the Calvinist princes of Germany, England entered. The alliance was to be sealed by the marriage of Elizabeth and the French king's brother, Henry of Navarre and the French king's sister. Coligny was to command the mixed army of Germans, Dutch, French, and English which was to destroy Alva. The idea of this alliance was doubtless elaborated in the camp before the battle of Moncontour by Orange and Coligny, and it connects them with the chief political movements of the next century. It was the germ of the grand design inaugurated by Henry IV., Coligny's pupil, which made France great. It was the model of the grand alliance with which William III., the great-grandson of Orange and the great-great-grandson of Coligny, broke the tyranny that Henry's grandson Louis the Magnificent founded on that greatness.

But the first realization of this large plan of strong men was prevented by the petty passions of weak women. In spite of its incessant wars the sixteenth century is marked to an extraordinary decree by the visible influence of women.

There were Mary of Scots and Margaret of Valois, "Succeses des Hommes," whose marvellous beauty, as Don John said of Marguerite, was "more divine than human, but better fitted to destroy men's souls than to bless them." Then there was Mary of England, whose weakly, passionate devotion was more disastrous to the world than their treachery was to their lovers. Besides these were Margaret of Parma, Jeanne d'Albret, Elizabeth of England, and Catherine de Medici.

The destinies of the Franco-Calvinist league lay in the hands of Elizabeth and Catherine, and the project which might have saved two generations of war was destroyed by their vanity and timidity.

Never was flirting so piquant as that of Elizabeth, for the destinies of nations hung on it; never was coquetry so interest-

ing to the coquette or so costly to other people as her playing with Alençon.

Catherine had lost every womanly quality except timidity. Her life had been swayed by every passion except that which involved the possibility of generous devotion. One can apply to her every name of dishonor from liar to murderer, and support the epithet by legal proof.

Afraid to risk the contest with Spain when Elizabeth's coquetry made her fear desertion by England, wounded because the Admiral had usurped her place as councillor of her son, Catherine rang the bell of St. Bartholomew. Never was crime greater or more profitless. Even from the Machiavellian standpoint it was a failure. It did too much or too little. Folly joined with ferocity in that plot of a woman and a child.

The great Huguenot fell. His fate has been like that of Cromwell. The literature of his country has just begun to recognize him as one of the greatest of her sons.

He never was popular with the people, but the young Huguenot nobles revered him like a father, and it was said of him at his death that "he carried the lilies of France in his heart."

William, who was already in arms when the massacre took place, wrote to Louis that it was a "*coup de massue.*" Alva and the Guises, the faithful servants of the reaction and Spain, joined hands. The Beggar was driven to the sands of Zealand, the Huguenot to the edge of the sea. There, behind the walls of Leyden, Alkmaar, and Rochelle, men and women (for the women fought in armor on the walls) stood at desperate bay and before that ferocious resistance the armies of Alva and the French crown melted away like hosts of snow beleaguering fires.

Three years later Orange, chief of the Northern Provinces, had united to them the Catholic provinces of the South, and was endeavoring to mix the oil and water of Catholicism and Calvinism, and to induce France or England to accept the protectorate.

But the party of the Catholic reaction in France had taken a leaf from the Calvinist book.

The Holy League bound together all Christians for the

support of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church, the honor of the king, and the privileges of the realm. It was blessed by the pope, backed by Spain, and led by the Guises.

They continued the old plan of removing the opposite leaders by assassination. There is extant a letter of the papal nuncio at Paris (1583) which shows the Guises, Philip, and probably the pope agreeing to raise the one hundred thousand francs necessary to pay the assassin of Elizabeth.

That plot failed, but another succeeded. For four years the ban had rested on Orange, and exposed his life to every assassin. The sixth attempt killed him. He spoke but once after the murderous balls struck him. His words were characteristic: "My God, have mercy on my soul! My God, have mercy on this people!"

And the people paid back his love. They knelt in the streets to bless him when he rode into their cities, and when he died, the young mourned as for a father, the old as for a son.

He breathed his last in the arms of his wife, the daughter of Coligny. In character and sufferings she is typical of the women who, in the age of the Reformation, ruled the world by inspiring men. Such were the mothers of Coligny and William of Orange, who never weighed their affection against truth, and taught their sons to live for duty.

For that which moved this great struggle was a great passion. We have had during the last generation a marvellous unravelling of the tangled skein of sixteenth-century diplomacy, and, by a natural reaction from the denominational histories, which saw in every warrior a Christian hero or a saint of the Church, it has become the fashion to present the history of the religious wars as a tangle of selfish interests, in which religion was only the pretext of ambition. Now, mean passions and personal ambitions always display themselves in time of war, and they abounded then. But, after all, that struggle was not aroused and maintained by skilful demagoguery. The forces in the great movements of history are elemental, and displays of fireworks do not evoke storms, in spite of General Dryenforth and Mr. Dryasdust.

When the Huguenot party, after St. Bartholomew, stagger-

ing to feet that slipped in their own blood, rushed on their astonished foe, when the goddess of Dutch liberty raised her hands against the dykes, and would have chosen death in the waves of her own sea to the embraces of the Spaniard—when men thus welded together courage and despair in a last brutal and heroic fight, it was no chance.

This similarity of result implies something in the cause. It was the same system of religious truth which animated the phlegmatic Dutchman and steeled the fiery Frenchman. They fought for liberty—not abstract liberty, but the liberty of their own truth—and that meant to them the supremacy of their own truth. For early Calvinism was, both in principle and spirit, intolerant. William's plan of toleration would never be carried out, because of his own followers, especially his Calvinistic followers. But the disciples of Calvin builded better than they knew. The struggle for their own liberty was really for the liberty of the world and the church.

Calvinism may appear to outsiders stiff. But history shows that it is the most flexible of all the types of Reform. It has assumed more varieties, undergone more changes, and expressed itself in more variant creeds, than any other. While other types of Reform stood with absolutism, it joined hands with the reëmerging renascence for civil liberty in France when the Protestant pastor Rabaut-St.-Etienne was elected president of the Constituent Assembly in 1790; in America when Witherspoon's speech helped to carry the Declaration of Independence which Jefferson wrote.

And in this country, when the successful war of the Revolution left it supreme, it reversed the teaching of Calvin, and broke with every tradition of its past to declare for absolute religious freedom—a free church in a free state.

And in that liberty, thanking God for the past but not fettered by it, a descendant of the race of the Beggars can speak frankly to the descendants of the Huguenots of the limitations and the heroism of the fathers.

THE HUGUENOTS OF ULSTER COUNTY.*

By Rev. Dr. J. G. Van Slyke, of Kingston, N. Y.

To many of you my paper must appear like the threshing of well-winnowed straw.

The peculiar interest which has invested the story of the early Huguenots of Ulster County has moved more than one pen to fix it in imperishable record. In various fragmentary pamphlets and chapters it may be found recited in glowing delineation.

But nowhere have I been able to find any attempt to mark the definite borders of this tributary stream of life which flowed toward Ulster County, to indicate the precise points where the French and the Dutch elements commingled; nor am I aware that any one has ever fused the *disjecta membra* of family traditions and annals, or the fragmentary papers which have been prompted by special celebrations and occasions, into one consistent and consecutive narrative.

I do not, therefore, in this paper, presume to bring you any new history not already well told by competent and accomplished writers; my more modest work will be to bring all the various parts of this fascinating story within the limits of a single and comprehensive picture.

In no part of this picture will you find a stain which might justly raise a blush, nothing over which you might feel inclined to hang the drapery of oblivion.

The early Huguenots of Ulster County were men of full-statured nobility, still looming large through the gathering mists of years. In pedigree and fineness of breeding they probably outranked the majority of the early colonists from the Netherlands. There was about them an indefinable moral

---

* Read before the Huguenot Society, March 16, 1893.

tone, an indefinite flavor of character, which has been perpetuated through repeated dilutions of descent.

They were preëminently a people of the purest religious conviction, whose Christian faith was buttressed by an unusual measure of intelligence. But while they maintained a strong grip of faith on the supernal world, they were not so rapt away as to be indifferent to the affairs of this present sphere. They stood solid on the ground. They were competent men, earnest, practical, executive. They coerced nature to yield its reluctant tribute. They were men who went to church through storm and shine every Sunday, and out of warm hearts sung God's praises, and who, as they traversed the secular days of the week, transmuted their faith into a steady integrity of life, and into generous thoughts and deeds.

We do not claim for the Huguenots of Ulster any characteristics other than those exhibited elsewhere. But these features of which I have reminded you were here given such an opportunity for their expression that the story of this early colony lends peculiar lustre to our American annals.

We have occasion for reproach against them that they have left us no autobiographies. In vain we have rummaged through dusty garrets for ancient notes or diaries, not already published.

The paucity of contemporary records is the more remarkable when we recall the fact that a large proportion of the early Huguenots were of a fair degree of culture. In contemporaneous England the masses could neither read nor write, while, among the Reformers of France and the Low Countries, the Scriptures were commonly found in every household.

That the early French refugees were not of a rude and illiterate class, may be fairly inferred from the quick impressibility of the French temperament and from their native alertness and eagerness of mind; and since we find them, previous to their emigration, in intimate contact with the notable culture and advancement of the Netherlands and the Palatinate, we can scarcely conceive of them as deficient in those accomplishments in which their world had ripened. If the cradle or the nursing has anything to do with the moulding of

the child, we may well consider their stimulating environment. In his "Literature of Europe" Hallam describes the inhabitants of the Low Countries, whence our French forefathers came, as "a great people, a people fertile of men of various ability and erudition, a people of scholars, of theologians and philosophers, of mathematicians, and, we may add, of poets." As a picture of the prevailing culture of the common people, take this story: In 1617, a young French soldier, serving in the Dutch army, was one day passing through the streets of Breda. His attention was arrested by an excited crowd, studying a paper posted on the wall, containing an abstruse mathematical problem, submitted in this way to the public for solution. Imagine, says Douglass Campbell, in his recent book on the Puritans, such an occurrence in the England of the Stuarts! There, we should have found crowds gathered around a bull-baiting or a dog-fight, but none before a problem in mathematics.

It was from such antecedents, and out of such environment, that the earlier Huguenot emigrants came. And if they neglected to leave us any heritage of kindling annals, we must conclude that they pursued the even tenor of their way without a dream that they were contributing any considerable part to the making of a new nation.

Their social position, and in some instances their affluence, are still attested by various heirlooms indicating rank and condition in their ancestral home; but in their new situation in the untamed wilderness of Ulster they had meagre opportunity for attitudinizing for the gratification of posterity.

The attention of the early immigrants had been drawn toward this region by certain books which had been printed and circulated in Holland, giving roseate descriptions of a new and fertile land which asked only for occupancy. One of these was a treatise on the native Indians, by Dominie Megapolensis, which contained graphic incidental accounts of the virgin territory.

A work by Joost Hartgers, published in Amsterdam in 1651, entitled "Short Account of New Netherlands Situation, Good Qualities, Natural Advantages, and Special Fitness for Populating," excited general interest.

I have been able to discover one or two other writings of a similar character, which we may regard as the weaving of the first cords that drew our fathers hither.

The first definite mention of the Dutch on the Hudson River is made in a little book, republished in the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, entitled, "A Brief Relation of the Discovery and Plantation of New England, and of Sundry Accidents therein Occurring, from the Year 1607 to this present 1622."

In this it is stated that an English sea-captain, Dermer, "met, on his passage from Virginia to New England, with certain Hollanders, who had a trade in Hudson's River, some years before this time," *i. e.*, 1619. This is probably the first application of Hudson's name to the river.

The Dutch, then, were the pioneers. But on account of their intimate affiliations, the French were quick to respond to the solicitations which reached them.

In 1626 a Huguenot of social prominence, Peter Minuit, was appointed Director of New Netherlands. Shortly before, a number of Walloons, compelled by French intolerance to leave their homes between the rivers Scheldt and Lys, had applied to Sir Dudley Carleton, principal Secretary of State to King Charles I., for permission to settle in Virginia. The answer of the Virginia colony not proving satisfactory, they turned their eyes upon New Netherland, where a small number of them arrived with Minuit. For some reason, they left the lands allotted to them on Staten Island, and went over to Wallabout (Wahlebocht, *i. e.*, bay of foreigners), in Brooklyn.

But a letter from Governor Bradford, of Plymouth Colony, dislodged them in 1627, earnestly asserting the right to exclusive possession. At a loss to find a satisfactory resting-place for the soles of their feet, they cast wistful glances up that river whence came occasional laden sloops from Esopus and Fort Orange.

No doubt, many a glowing representation was made to these homeless Huguenots of the attractiveness of the region overhung by the stately Catskills, where prospects of generous harvests only waited the golden key of industry.

But be this as it may, it was shortly after that the first Huguenot names appear in the early documents which chronicle the life of Kingston.

By the instinct of elective affinity they gravitated toward those Dutch friends from whom they had never experienced a rebuff; and, without a trace of discord or attrition, became, by intermarriage and common pursuits as well as sympathetic religious faith, fused into one homogeneous population.

There is a current saying among the old families of Ulster, more glib than just, that "the Huguenots came for piety and the Dutch for pelf." This is one of those facile generalities, which has, by *suppressio veri*, distorted the facts, and done injustice to the colonists from Holland, who, though thrifty and sagacious, were at the same time largely imbued with religious principles. Nevertheless, the saying does give emphasis to the essential truth that the early Huguenots of Ulster gave illustration to those Christian virtues which seem to have been ingrained into the very tissue of their characters, and which, on account of the greater ardor and assertiveness of the French temperament, were rendered more pronounced and conspicuous.

That their number was relatively small, we know; and yet that these Huguenots were a spiritual yeast or tonic in the nascent community which was beginning to form is manifest by the way in which the permeations of their influence asserted themselves in the administration of the Church, and in the secular life of the young village. The ties of moral consanguinity and the fellowship of faith were felt to be so close that the lines of cleavage between the French and Dutch can scarcely be traced, except as it is disclosed in the alternate use of their respective languages, in the early records of the one church in which they harmoniously worshipped. No jealousies or racial antipathies seem to have rippled their common life; through a process of perfect sympathy they were amalgamated into one. From our church records it is occasionally possible to disinter hints of a pronounced and vigorous type among the Huguenots, throbbing with such French ardors as the Dutch blood lacked. A much larger proportion of them,

we are sure, were communicant members of the church. They were zealous in the maintenance of the family altar, and less susceptible than their Dutch brethren to the seductions of the cup and the table. In many a thrifty and virtuous household on the banks of the Esopus and the Wallkill, the Huguenot name still stands as almost a synonyme for those virtues which are most to be revered and cherished.

The Dutch colonists had, as I have said, preceded the French ingredient by a few years.

As early as 1615 we find that Dutch navigators were following in the wake of Hendrick Hudson (1609) in exploring the Hudson.

It was one of their first enterprises to erect a fort or redoubt at the mouth of the kill where Rondout now stands; the modern name of the town is but a corruption of the word *redoubt*.

Around this fort as a nucleus, but with a tendency to extend back over the fertile meadows through which the Esopus Creek flows, the young community of Esopus gradually formed.

Of this place Dominie Megapolensis wrote, in 1656: "About half-way between the Manhattans and Beaverwyck lies a place called by the Dutch Esopus, or Sypous; by the Indians, Atkarkarton. It is an exceedingly beautiful country." That Megapolensis had visited the place and rendered religious service there, is a natural inference. In all probability it was he who initiated the enterprise of here founding a church; for in the following year, 1657, according to tradition, we find that such an organization was effected, and that by the appointment of Petrus Stuyvesant, a *voorleser—i. e.*, a curate or lay-reader and schoolmaster—was sent to Esopus, one Andrus van Slyk, a son of Cornelius Antonissen van Slyk, who had obtained a patent for the land extending from Catskill to New Baltimore, and from whom the present pastor of the church is descended.

Among those whose names appear as constituting the membership of this church we discover no patronymics indicating a French or Walloon origin, unless we allow that a

French name had previously been transmuted into a Dutch equivalent, as we know was occasionally done.

To this absence of French patronymics there are five exceptions, viz.: Louis Du Bois and his wife, received by Hermanus Blom, on "attestation," from Fort Orange, June 20, 1661; and about the same time Andre Lefevra, Simon Lefevra, and Margaret Du Mon. These were evidently the first birds of the larger flock soon to follow. The church records of a few years later yield the following Huguenot names: Perrine, Delamater, Lagrandsie, De la Montagne, Gacherie, Fanueil, Fauconnier, Bonnemere, De la Valle, La Conte, Depuy, Poitiers, Saumaine, Vallou, and others. The only side-lights which can afford us any illumination to this period of their life in Esopus are furnished us in some mercantile records which are in the custody of the First Reformed Church of Kingston, exhibiting that they were engaged in agriculture and such domestic arts as a new community would require. By steady accretion, by accessions from Manhattan and New Rochelle and Brooklyn and Fort Orange, the little community slowly grew, until the occurrence of the so-called "Second Esopus War," fully described in the "Documentary History of New York," Vol. IV.

It would be quite unwarrantable in me to repeat, except in outline, this twice-told tale; but it opens a chapter of such moment in the history of the Ulster Huguenots that it must be recalled.

Like the ancient persecutions of the Christians in the young New Testament church in Jerusalem, who were scattered abroad by the hostility of the Jews—who thus became the involuntary distributors of the truth as it is in Jesus—this war was the occasion which scattered the germs of that moral life and enterprise which had been concentrated in Esopus, and distributed it through various parts of Ulster County, and especially in the valley of the Wallkill.

The story of this dispersion, while not transcending the bounds of unimpeachable history, is yet colored with all the hues of romance.

The relations between the native Indians who hovered

around the settlement and the early colonists had, for several years, been far from amicable. The Indians had been annoyed by trespass of the white people's cattle and dogs upon their patches of maize and beans. Many of them had become addicted to the use of spirituous liquors, which, of course, intensified every phase of their native depravity. And, worst of all, the Indian women were accused of practising lecherous wiles on the husbands and young men of the settlement, exasperating their wives and sisters to bitter animosity. It was, in part, the very purity of their morals which fomented the collision between the natives and the early settlers.

But after the clash of the first outbreak of hostilities it was supposed that a truce could be maintained, and under the anodyne of prosperity the young village of Esopus was lulled into carelessness. The Indians put on a mask of amity. The stockade which had been erected to guard their homes was allowed to fall into decay. But on June 6, 1663, the misleading dream of Indian friendliness was wofully and suddenly broken.

The particulars of the massacre which then occurred have been so often and graphically recited that I have no occasion to repeat them. Though the assault had been adroitly planned, and appeared to have contemplated the complete extermination of the settlement, the Indians were soon repulsed, and, by a change of wind, when the flames were leaping from their burning homes, the village was spared from complete destruction.

But though the savages were soon driven out, it was not without spoils and captives in their cruel grasp.

According to the best testimony, the captives numbered forty-four souls, including one man, twelve married women, and thirty-one children. Among them were the wife and three children of one of the most notable of the Huguenots, Louis Du Bois. He himself appears to have been absent from the place at the time of the massacre, having gone out to his farm toward Hurley. Captain Kregier's account recites that he had gone to search for a yoke of lost oxen, and that, on his return, three Indians leaped upon him, from an ambush, whom he

overpowered and knocked down with a club, after which he dashed through the creek and made his escape, but only to discover the catastrophe which, in his absence, had desolated his own as well as the other homes of Esopus, and to be greeted by appalling spectacles of carnage and heart-breaking wails.

The survivors appear to have been at first paralyzed with a sense of their utter impotence. But after their temporary bewilderment had passed, word was sent to New York for succor. Ten days after the massacre Lieutenant Christian Wyssen arrived, with forty-two soldiers; and on July 4 Captain Martin Kregier came with two sloops, well laden with men and ammunition. The first problem was the recovery of the captives, whose whereabouts were unknown. The Indians were believed to have broken apart into little scattered companies, and were known to be moving about from place to place, in order to elude the apprehended pursuit.

But at last Captain Kregier gained some information, which seemed trustworthy, that the captives had all been collected in a camp on one of the eastern slopes of the Shawangunk Mountains. Accordingly Captain Kregier, conducted by a friendly Indian guide, started with forty-five men and eight horses, on a search.

Who were included in this company we have no way of knowing. But we may be confident that Louis Du Bois, and probably Matthew Blanshau, his brother-in-law, were the animating and aggressive spirits of the expedition.

This rescuing party plodded southward through the primeval forests, and on the 5th of September, three months after the massacre, had the joy of realizing their aim. Captain Kregier's account of the assault upon the well-fortified Indian encampment is so familiar in every Huguenot home that we have no occasion to repeat it. There are few stories more striking than the well-authenticated tradition that the rescuing party burst upon the encampment at the very moment when the savages were making their preparations for the slaughter of one of their prisoners, and that one none other than the wife of Louis Du Bois. The Du Bois "Family Record" relates that

she had been placed on a pile of wood, on which she was to be burned to death; that, beguiled by her sweet singing, they had delayed to start the fire; and that at the very moment when she was singing the beautiful Psalm of the Babylonish captives, the 137th, the shouts of her deliverers broke on her ears.

The story has such a strong flavor of the dramatic that cautious historians are inclined to credit it to the creative capacity of an ardent imagination. But we are not aware that there is any other warrant for impeaching its substantial truthfulness.

The course of this rescuing party had taken them across the rich alluvial valley of the Wallkill, till then a *terra incognita*. In the pauses of their search they had been diverted by the fair panorama spread before them; and the interest thus kindled was doubtless strengthened by the accounts which the recovered members of their households could give; and now, after their return to Esopus, their thoughts reverted to those inviting lands, waiting to be appropriated, and across which none but migratory Indians strolled.

Finally a plan was matured to reëxamine this region, and, if possible, secure, by purchase from the Indians, a considerable tract. In this move, the noteworthy point is that those who entertained this project were exclusively Huguenots. The colony was organized by a segregation of many of the French families of Esopus, probably due to a natural craving to hear their own mellifluous tongue used, especially in those services of worship which, for them, constituted so large a part of life, and which had been denied them in the ministrations of the sanctuary in Kingston. It was not a break due to any lack of cordiality; nor did it, in the inception of the enterprise, involve any actual separation. The most intimate relations of trade continued to be maintained with Kingston; and until their church at New Paltz was organized, in January, 1683, they were accustomed, Sunday after Sunday, to traverse the sixteen miles between the two places.

To the Kingston church they faithfully brought their children for baptism; and, according to a well-authenticated story, the present bell of the Kingston church owes its existence to

offerings of silver articles and vessels of other metal, which were brought in grateful acknowledgment, and which, having been sent to Holland, were melted together and moulded in the bell which still rings the hours and calls to worship. In each stroke of its clatter we may hear the jingle of silver spoons, on which many a child of the long ago left the print of its first tooth, and with which many an ancient dame or grandsire stirred the sugar in the mellowing punch.

There is a not altogether untrustworthy legend that, on one of those occasions when parents were bringing their children for baptism, a descendant of Louis Du Bois with his wife and babe were crossing on the ice of Rondout Creek. The ice gave way, plunging the sleigh, horses, and party all in the stream. With great presence of mind the mother threw her infant, an only son, upon a cake of floating ice, from which he was rescued by spectators on the shore, who had witnessed the occurrence. The parents and driver were drowned. For some time this child was the only male Du Bois among the New Paltz Huguenots, and had he perished on that occasion the family name, as far as that branch of it is concerned, would have perished with him. The number who now claim descent from him is legion.

But from this digression let me revert to the French swarm that was about leaving the Dutch hive at Kingston. The spot selected for their alighting was the fertile region now covered by the town of New Paltz.

Application was made to Governor Andros for a patent covering one hundred and forty-four square miles. And as their religious instincts prompted them to draw a parallel between themselves and the ancient children of Israel, they chose twelve men who should be to them like the twelve Patriarchs, and to whose control they proposed to submit. These were the twelve Patentees, viz., Louis Du Bois, Abraham Du Bois, Isaac Du Bois, Abraham Hasbrouck, Andries Lefevre, Jean Hasbrouck, Peter Deyo, Louis Bevier, Antoine Crispell, Hugo Freer, John Brook, *i. e.*, Hasbrouck, and Simon Lefevre; the name of Christian Diau, since, however, written Deyo, also appears. The curious document which records their agreement with the Indians is still preserved at Albany; the price paid for the land

is specified as consisting of axes, kettles, lead, powder, wine, knives, awls, blankets, needles, and one clean pipe.

The dominating spirit of this migrating colony was doubtless Louis Du Bois. It was seventeen years since he had come from Mannheim; he was a vigorous, hearty character, and one who would naturally be looked up to; after ten years' sojourn at New Paltz he returned to Kingston, where he died.

The next most interesting figure of the group is Abraham Hasbroucq, as the name was originally spelled. He was a native of Calais, having emigrated thence to the Palatinate on the Rhine, and, after a short stay there, came to this country in 1675. Another conspicuous person, who would impress his influence on the colony, was Bevier. I omitted to mention above that this movement toward New Paltz did not embrace all the French inhabitants of Kingston; twenty such families remained; but those who went forth were, doubtless, the more ambitious and spirited; men, perhaps, who had dreams that they should, in their new situation, realize some Utopia; men who,

> "Rowing hard against the stream,
> Saw distant gates of Eden gleam."

I pass over the story of their migration and settlement as not requiring recital. Their dreams of a fair earthly lot were mainly realized. What a modern philosopher has called "the out-populating power of a Christian stock" reveals the vigorous and affluent life of those early Huguenots, now widely diffused throughout the whole region.

But the long isolated position of New Paltz, conjoined with a jealousy for intermarriage exclusively among the Walloons, has perpetuated, without material change, not only the original French names, but also a definite Huguenot tone, as well as various phases of life and character not easily portrayed.

As might have been anticipated, their positive religious faith very speedily crystallized in a church of their own; an organization which has now grown to stately proportions, and which still conserves the rare ancient spirit and Christian fervor.

As Longfellow, in other allusion, suggests, it was "win-

nowed seed" which God used for this sowing. The recreant or faint-hearted remained in France, or sought sheltered retreats in neighboring lands; they were the heroic, the vigorous, the zealous, who came hither. Among all the tributary streams of life which have fructified this land, none were charged with more precious elements. It was their mission to heighten the ardor of our blood and to accelerate its flow.

Not a few of the Huguenots conceived of themselves as but transient sojourners here in a place of temporary asylum, secure against the smitings of persecution, waiting for a change in the government of France; we know that many of them dreamed of returning, under favoring auspices, to the father-land. But they were working out an unsuspected errand. The Dutch may have contributed to them elements which deepened and steadied their piety; but it was theirs, in turn, to yield to the Holland blood ingredients which are essential to symmetry. And we acknowledge this as our debt of gratitude to the Huguenots, that they have contributed potencies which have had the effect to sublimate our faith and dilate our spiritual life.

THE EMBLEMATIC FLOWER AND DISTINGUISHING COLOR OF THE HUGUENOTS.*

By Mrs. James M. Lawton.

"The Sun-observing Marigold."—*Quarles.*

It is a tradition of the present day that the Marigold, in times past, was the emblematic flower of the Huguenots—some say their badge. It is even affirmed that, in one of their battles, each chief wore a Marigold plucked from the garden of Jeanne d'Albret. Could this be proved, how proudly would we don that

> "Homely forgotten flower,
> Under the rose's bower,
> Plain as a weed."—*Bayard Taylor.*

But, alack-a-day, we all know how hard it is to prove what really happened, even thirty years ago! Before searching for our flower, let us turn our attention for a few moments to the battles in which the Huguenots were engaged, and find if Jeanne d'Albret ever gave the chiefs or soldiers any talisman.

In Hanna's "History of the Huguenots" I find the following:

"Catherine of Valois, heiress of Navarre, married, in 1491, into the House d'Albret. Henry, the second King of Navarre belonging to this house, married, in 1528, Marguerite d'Angoulême, the favorite sister of Francis I. Marguerite, who was more than half a Huguenot, opened an asylum at Nérac for her persecuted countrymen; died in 1549. One daughter, Jeanne, was born in 1528, became Protestant on the accession of Charles IX. to the French throne. She married Antoine of Condê—son,

---

* Read before the Huguenot Society, April 13, 1893.

Henry IV. At Cognac, after the death of Condé, Jeanne gave an eloquent address to the Huguenots, *giving them her son*, who then became leader. Before leaving La Rochelle she had a medal struck, heads of herself and her son, with the inscription, '*Pax certa—victoria integra—mors honesta*,' and HUNG ONE AROUND THE NECK OF EACH DISTINGUISHED CHIEF at St. Yrieix."

Thus we see that our Marigold, true to its God-given nature, still points to the *sun*. *The* flower of Jeanne d'Albret's garden was surely her *son*, Henry IV.!

But I have not yet proved that the Marigold *is our flower*. A committee was appointed by our Society in the spring of 1891, to find if, perchance, in the Garden of History we could cull *one* Marigold. This committee was also to try and settle the disputed point as to the Huguenot color, and to offer some suggestions in regard to the selection of a badge.

It is the purpose of this paper to show the result of my investigations on these points. Woman-like, I first asked every one who was likely to give me any information. Permit me to read two letters received in reply.

GRACE CHURCH RECTORY.

DEAR MRS. LAWTON:

Neither my memory nor my books of reference (which I have carefully examined) enable me to help you in the matter of the Huguenot flower. If there be such a thing in the world's flora as a white lily dashed with blood red, it would seem to meet the requirements of the case.

Yours faithfully,

W. R. HUNTINGTON.

March 9, 1891.

OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK JOURNAL OF COMMERCE,
March 19, 1891.

Mr. James M. Lawton.

DEAR SIR:

Our Editor-in-Chief, Mr. David M. Stone, directs me to write you in reply to your letter of March 18. Your previous letter regarding the emblematic flower and distinguishing color of the Huguenots was

duly received. Mr. Stone was unable to find anything decisive of the question in his own library. I was then directed to make a search through the Astor Library, which I did, but with no better success. I looked through all of the books there which seemed to me likely to contain anything upon the subject, including several which had been put aside at the request of a lady (perhaps it was Mrs. Lawton) in search of the same object. Professor Baird, who has written several of the best books in the English language upon the history of the Huguenots, was unable to throw any light upon the subject. The question had previously been put to him by a lady, but he professed himself unable to answer it. Thus much have I written to assure you that your request has not been overlooked or neglected. I shall make a further search for the information in a few days, and if it is more successful than the previous one, I shall take pleasure in giving you prompt information of the result.

Very respectfully yours,

FRANK T. RUSK,
City Ed. Journal of Commerce.

These failures roused the Huguenot spirit within me, and early one spring morning I went forth, as did our ancestors of old, knowing no such word as fail. I botanized at the Astor Library for ten days, with the spade of grim determination and the pruning hook of common sense, and I found not only the flower, but the root thereof. Permit me to lay my gleanings before the Huguenot Society of America. From "Les Fleurs Emblématiques," par Mme. Leveneux: "Souci (Peine, Chagrin). Calendula officinalis, famille des radiées. Plante annuelle, indigène, commune dans les vignes. La culture en a fait une belle plante, dont les fleurs, simples ou doubles, jaunes ou saffronées, se montrent pendant toute la belle saison. L'aieule de Henri IV., Marguerite d'Orléans, avait pour devise un souci tournant sa corelle vers le soleil, et pour âme, 'Je ne veux suivre que lui seul.' La dévotion, voulait exprimer par là, que son âme était toujours tournée vers le ciel, comme la fleur du Souci l'ait, vers l'astre du jour." I find in "Le Manuel des Fleurs" nearly the same words.

From the "Flora Symbolica," by John Ingram:

"Marigold—*Calendula*—supposed to bloom during every month, means grief. By old English poets these plants are called golds. The name of the Virgin Mary was a very frequent addition in the middle ages to anything useful or beautiful, and so, in course of time, these flowers became known as the Marygold. Margaret of Orleans, the maternal grandmother of Henry the Great, to express how all her thoughts and affections were directed toward heaven, adopted for her armorial device a Marygold turning toward the Sun, with the motto: 'Je ne veux suivre que lui suel.'"

From "La France Protestante," par M. Haag:

"Marguerite avait prit pour embléme, une fleur de tournesol, avec ces mots de Virgile 'Non inferiora secutus.'"

From D'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation," Chap. IV., Book XI., p. 442: " . . . Margaret of Valois, Duchess of Alençon, whom Francis tenderly loved, and always called 'Sa Mignonne,' as we learn from Brantôme. . . . Her ruling passion was to do good and prevent evil. . . . She was one of the first to be carried away by the religious movement then beginning in France. . . . There was at the court of Francis I. one soul in particular which seemed prepared to receive the evangelical influence of Etaples and the Bishop of Meaux. Margaret, yet hesitating and wavering in the midst of the depraved society that surrounded her, looked for support and found it in the Gospel. She turned toward this fresh breath that was reanimating the world, and inhaled it with delight as an emanation from heaven. From some of the ladies of her court she learnt what the new doctors were teaching—they lent her their writings, called in the language of the time 'tracts.' . . . Ere long, this princess conversed with Lefevre, Farel, and Rousel. . . . But it was the Bishop of Meaux in particular, who had long enjoyed her friendship, that became her guide in the path of faith. Thus, in the midst of the brilliant court of Francis I. and of the profligate household of Louisa of Savoy, was accomplished one of those conversions of the heart which, although not thoroughly evangelical, are not the fruit of a mere esthetical religion. . . . Margaret,

seeking in nature the symbols that might express the wants and affections of her soul, chose for her emblem, says Brantôme, the Marigold, which by its rays and leaves has more affinity with the sun, and turns wherever he goes. She added this device: 'Non inferiora secutus' (I seek not things below), as a sign, says the courtly writer, that she directed all her actions, thoughts, desires, and affections to that great Sun which is God, and hence she was suspected of being attached to the Lutheran religion. . . . Denounced to the king, who, tenderly attached to his sister, pretended to think it was untrue. . . . Neither Germany nor England present her equal. She is a star, slightly clouded, no doubt, but shedding an indescribable and gentle radiance, and at the time of which I am treating, her rays shine out still more brightly. It was not until later, when the angry looks of Francis I. denounce a mortal hatred against the Reformation, that his frightened sister will screen her holy faith from the light of day. But now she raises her head in the midst of this corrupted court and appears a bride of Christ. The respect paid her, the high opinion entertained of her understanding and of her heart, plead the cause of the Gospel at the court of France much better than any preacher could have done. The gentle influence of woman gained admission for the new doctrine," etc.

As D'Aubigné's account of the adoption of the marigold by Margaret is a translation and amplification of that by Brantôme, I omit his quaint old French.

There are more than twenty varieties of the marigold—light straw color to deep brown, mixed with yellow and red, and from single to those as double as carnations. My reasons for choosing the single wild flower, are, (1) because I am told that in a state of high cultivation they do *not* turn toward the sun; and, (2) because that is the variety represented in an old print of the device of Margaret.

This armorial device of Marguerite de Valois is in "Historic Devices, Badges, and War Cries," by Mrs. Fannie Bury Palliser, page 163.

Are we not justified in adopting the marigold for our emblematic flower? Let us rescue it from the oblivion to

which Bayard Taylor condemns it, and bring it again to the light of day.

> "Nor shall the marigold unmentioned die,
> Which Acis once found out in Sicily,
> She Phœbus loves, and from him draws her hue,
> And ever keeps his golden beams in view."
>
> —*Translation from Rupin*, 1706.

If I have not exhausted your patience, will you follow me still further into the field of history, and find out with me what color was adopted by our Huguenot ancestors. As before, I quote my authorities, leaving you to form your own conclusions. I read a letter from Mr. Henry M. Baird, one of our honorary members, and whose authority on such matters cannot be questioned.

219 PALISADE AVENUE, YONKERS. N. Y.,
March 2, 1891.

Mrs. James M. Lawton.

DEAR MADAM:

In reference to the Huguenot color, if there was any distinctive one, it must have been white. When, in 1589, some months after the murder of Henry of Guise, the Duke of Mayenne made an attack upon the troops of Henry of Valois and Henry of Navarre, now united, in the suburbs of the city of Tours, the latter and his Huguenot followers wore the white scarf over their shoulders. This led to the dramatic incident which I have recorded in my "Huguenots and Henry of Navarre," Vol. II., 149. The soldiers of the League, seeing the Huguenots charging them under the leadership of the son of Admiral Coligny, brave François de Châtillon, cried out: "Withdraw, wearers of the *white scarf!* Withdraw, brave Huguenots, honorable men! Withdraw, Châtillon! It is not with you we have to do, but with that perjurer, the murderer of your father."

Pierre de l'Estoile, in his "Mémoires," I., 294, and Agrippa d'Aubigné, in his "Histoire Universelle," III., 169, give the speeches in almost identical words; the former, "Retirez-vous, *escharpes blanches*, retirez-vous, Chastillon, ce n'est pas à vous que nous en voulons, c'est aux meurtriers de vostre père;" the latter, "Là, *les escharpes*

blanches desesperèrent, par leur veuë seulement, l'entreprise des Leguez, qui leur crioient, ceux de la ville le pouvant ouïr. Braves Huguenots, gens d'honneur, ce n'est pas à vous à qui nous en voulons," etc.

I think this shows, at any rate, that it would be sufficiently safe to adopt *white* as a Huguenot color.

I remain, dear madam,

Very truly yours,

HENRY M. BAIRD.

At the battle of Ivry Henry IV. wore a plume of white feathers in his crest and on his horse's head.

Lord Macaulay says:

"The fiery duke is pricking fast across St. André's plain
With all the hireling chivalry of Guelders and Almayne.
* * * * * * *
Charge for the golden lilies, upon them with the lance.
* * * * * * *
Press where ye see my white plume shine, amid the ranks of war,
And be your oriflamme to-day the helmet of Navarre."

From D'Aubigné's "Histoire de la Réformation:" "Henri de Navarre, devenu roi de France, prit l'écharpe blanche, celle-ci ne fut plus quittée depuis. A la bataille d'Ivry, la cornette blanche était arborée des deux partis, ligueur et royaliste en même temps. Les mots de Henri IV. sont bien connus, 'Si vos cornettes vous manquent, ce panache blanc vous servira tant que j'aurais une goutte de sang.'" From "Le Costume Historique," by Rasinet, Tome IV., Planche 257: "Les réformés portérent tous la casaque blanche—'du moins étoit à toute le fond blanc, *bordé de telle couleur que la devise du chef demandait* —avec l'escharpe blanche pour les discerner des Catholiques.' Après la mort de Condé, tué à Jarnac, 1569, ils prirent l'echarpe jaune et noire du Prince des Deux Ponts venu à leur secours. 'A Moncontour toute l'armée étoit en blanc, l'escharpe de taffetas jaune et noir.' Le parti Catholique et le parti Protestant se distinguaient par la couleur de leurs echarpes, de leurs casaques, et les banderoles de leurs lances. Les Pro-

testants avaient conservé le blanc, ancienne couleur nationale, ils portaient tous sur leurs armes des casaques blanches—blanches *bordées* '*de telle couleur que la devise du chef demandoit.*' Les Catholiques, les echarpes et les banderoles rouges, en l'honneur du roi d'Espagne, leur allié."

From "Couleurs de France, ses Enseignes et ses Drapeaux," par R. Quarré de Verneuil :

"Durant les guerres civiles dont le massacre de Vasey 1562, est le sanglaut début, les Huguenots du Prince de Condé prennent la casaque et echarpe blanche—'pour marque,' dit la Popeliniére, 'd'une netteté de conscience au dessein par eux fait, pour maintenir l'honneur de Dieu et du public.'"

"Coligny avait l'enseigne blanche."

Should the Society decide that white is our Huguenot color, may I suggest for a ribbon, "le fond blanc bordé de telle couleur que notre chef demande"?—the white ribbon with an edge of a *single* thread of the red, white, and blue. For the English Society, the white ribbon with their national colors, and the German with theirs ; thus showing to all whom it may concern that, while we are *all* Huguenots, we each fight under our own banner.

In the several designs made by Tiffany & Co. for our proposed badge, and which are to be submitted to you this evening, you see on all the "Huguenot bow." This, I am assured by Mr. Whitehouse, the great authority on such matters, and by many others whom I have consulted, has been known as such for so long that it has never been questioned. As yet, I have not found authority to prove it historical. Shall we accept it as tradition ?

The bell is that of St. Germain l'Auxerrois, which tolled the knell of St. Bartholomew.

The anvil was the emblem of the old Huguenot Church. From "La France Protestante," by M. Haag, I quote : "Les belles paroles de Théodore de Béze au roi de Navarre, Antoine de Bourbon, 'Sire, c'est il est vrai, à l'Eglise de Dieu, au nom de laquelle je parle, d'endurer les coups, et non pas d'en donner ; mais aussi vous plaira-t'il vous souvenir, que c'est une enclume qui a déjà usé beaucoup de marteaux.'" On the

cover of one of the editions of D'Aubigné's book is an anvil, on which blacksmiths are hammering in turn, with the motto,

"Plus à me frapper on s'amuse
Plus de marteaux on y use."

I have not seen this edition myself, but my authority is Mademoiselle Leclèrc, whom all New Yorkers know. This anvil, as you see by the designs, is very difficult to arrange in a badge. As a seal it would be perfect.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

Ladies and Gentlemen :—Since our last anniversary we have lost some of our most cherished members, and among them two whose memories are closely identified with our Society—Dr. Vermilye, the venerable pastor and our faithful friend, to whose reminiscences of the Huguenots we have listened with so much pleasure, and Mrs. Martha J. Lamb, who has been suddenly taken from the active labors that illustrated her "History of New York," and the *Magazine of American History*. Her researches and interesting sketches, historic and biographical, have increased the growing interest in the past of America, and her success may well stimulate our historic students, especially among trained and accomplished women, to emulate her bright example.

It was a pleasant thing for our Society, some time after its formation, to learn that we had a sister association in the Huguenot Society of London, and that pleasure has been year by year increased by the excellent work systematically and steadily done by that body, with its brilliant staff of Fellows, its accomplished lady members, and the working Council under the lead of its accomplished president, the Right Honorable Sir Henry Austin Layard, who, after mastering the secrets of Nineveh, is now engaged in exploring the dark recesses of Italian diplomacy, and disclosing secrets of the historic past that had been carefully hidden and persistently denied.

It was again a source of gratification to learn of the organization, under the Presidency of Dr. Henry Tollin, of the Huguenot Society of Germany. This is a most important addition to the societies with which we were already in sympathy and correspondence, and which include the Society at Paris of French Protestant History, under Baron Schickler, and the Société d'Histoire Vaudoise, whose members recently celebrated the anniversary of their return from Switzerland under Henry Arnaud, some two hundred years ago.

Our correspondence with these bodies is something more than a reminder of the tie which associated the Waldenses, the Walloons, and the Huguenots in the sacred memories of the past; when our ancestors, speaking in great part the same tongue and united in the same faith, suffered persecutions even to death, or were driven from their homes to seek in foreign lands liberty to read the Bible, and to enjoy in peace liberty of conscience and freedom of worship.

New light has been thrown by Huguenot research on the emigration which followed the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the still earlier emigration to England and America of thousands of the Walloons whom the introduction of the Spanish Inquisition in the Netherlands had driven into exile. They brought to the New Netherlands men like Bayard, De la Forest, and De la Montagne, who figured so prominently in our colonial history; and to England the Walloons, who had their churches in London, Canterbury, Norwich, Southampton, and other towns, and to whom was granted the use of the crypt or under-croft of the cathedral at Canterbury, where their descendants, amid its cherished memories, still hold the old Huguenot service in the original French, with the familiar tunes, and Clement Marot's version of the Psalms of David.

But the field of Huguenot research is still largely unexplored from northern Europe to southern Africa. And this pleasant thought blends with the efforts of their descendants of various nationalities to gather and preserve the memories of their ancestors. Whatever the horror and crimes which that checkered history may disclose, we know the heroism and devotion that marked the course of the Huguenots; we know that God's blessing attended them in the persecutions of which they were the martyrs, and which have been made to serve, under the divine guidance of the Ruler of Nations, in advancing the enlightenment of peoples, and shaping, however unconsciously to the unobservant, the conduct of nations and the future of the world.

Dr. Smiles, in his admirable work [1867] on "The Huguenots: their Settlements, Churches, and Industries in Eng-

land and France,"* which should be widely circulated in America, reminds us that, according to Sismondi, "The loss to France was not far short of a million persons, and those her best and most illustrious subjects." This estimate of nearly a million exceeds the estimates of other historians, especially of those opposed to the Huguenots, who have shown a disposition to minimize the effects of the Revocation; but it would seem to be largely exceeded by the estimate of the Duke de Simon, a Roman Catholic courtier of Louis XIV., whose testimony as that of a contemporary is entitled to weight, and whose view of the whole transaction is of interest as expressing with truth and exactness what Dr. Charles Baird rightly calls "the impartial judgment of the age and of posterity on this stupendous act of despotism and bigotry." The Duke de Simon said (Baird's "History of Huguenot Emigration," Vol. I., pp. 259, 260), and his views are believed to be shared by the most intelligent and honorable co-religionists of the duke in our day: "The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, without the slightest pretext or the least necessity, as well as the various proclamations, or, rather, proscriptions that followed, were the fruits of that horrible conspiracy which depopulated a fourth part of the kingdom, ruined its trade, weakened it throughout, surrendered it for so long a time to open and avowed pillage by the dragoons, and authorized the torments and sufferings by means of which they procured the death of so many persons of both sexes and by thousands together. A plot that brought ruin upon so great a body of people, that tore asunder countless families, arraying relatives against relatives for the purpose of getting possession of their goods, whereupon they left them to starve. A plot that caused our manufactures to pass over into the hands of foreigners, made their states to flourish and grow populous at the expense of our own, and enabled them to build new cities. A plot that presented to the nations the spectacle of so vast a multitude of people, who had committed no crime, proscribed, denuded, fleeing, wandering, seeking an

* This volume has been republished by the Harpers in New York, and by the South Methodist Publishing Company, at Nashville, Tenn.

asylum afar from their country. A plot that consigned the noble, the wealthy, the aged, those highly esteemed, in many cases for their piety, their learning, their virtue, those accustomed to a life of ease, frail, delicate, to hard labor in the galleys under the driver's lash, and for no reason save that of their religion."

Dr. Smiles offered his valuable volume as a contribution to the result of that emigration, to which the Huguenot Society of London is engaged in making such important additions in regard to English industry and history. But while much light has been thrown upon the Huguenots who came to England and to America, we know comparatively little of those who found homes in Holland, Switzerland, Prussia, and other parts of Germany, Denmark, and even Russia; and one body, under the lead of a nephew of Admiral Duquesne, emigrated to the Cape of Good Hope, where, according to Weiss, four thousand of their descendants maintain the Huguenot faith in French Valley, and another colony settled at Surinam, Dutch Guiana. Thus far, as Smiles remarks, "that extraordinary exodus of the Revocation has received but slight notice as regards its historic results at the hand of the historian. Michelet, the French writer, expresses his regret that Macaulay had failed to do justice to the Huguenot followers of William of Orange, while reckoning up the English, Swiss, Swedes, and Dutch among his followers, although the flower of William's army when he landed at Torbet, November 15, 1688, consisted of Huguenot soldiers trained under Schomberg, Turenne, and Condé, with two thousand two hundred and fifty infantry and an entire squadron of French cavalry trained by Schomberg himself, veteran troops, many of them gentlemen born, with three of William's body-guard and horse-guard.

"But if Macaulay, by a regrettable accident or incident, still unexplained, failed to do justice to the very important part borne by the Huguenots in England under William of Orange, in establishing on a firm basis the constitutional liberties of the English people, there is no lack of conclusive English testimony to the character and action of the Huguenots in England during the period of the revolution. Their military services, in

regard to which the Huguenot Society of London may perhaps supplement the omission of an account, were a fitting return for the welcome given to the Huguenots of England, which is one of the brightest features of her history, especially when it was freely rendered in defiance of foreign dictation. When Henry IV., in 1598, promulgated the Edict of Nantes, which was entitled, 'Edict of the King for the Pacification of the troubles of the Kingdom,' and by which, after sixty years of persecution, although the Edict was by no means all that they could wish—since, while it recognized fully and impartially civil rights in the right of private conscience, it restricted the liberty of public worship—the Edict greatly exasperated their enemies; and their own thankful joy at this enactment was met by a declaration of Pope Clement VIII. that a decree which had given liberty of conscience to all mankind was the most accursed decree that had ever been made."

Dr. Schaff, in his able paper read before our Society on the "History of the Revocation of the Decree of Nantes," after giving a frightful picture of the atrocities without a name perpetrated upon the Huguenots, even women and children, after the Revocation of the Edict by Louis XIV., records the fact that the Pope Innocent XI. celebrated the Revocation with a Te Deum, as his predecessor had celebrated the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in addition to its commemoration by still existing medals and the frescos of Vassari.

Henry, disregarding threats from whatever quarter, fairly maintained the Edict till he fell by the knife of the Jesuit assassin, Ravaillac, in 1610, an assassination which Pope Paul V. called "a divine chastisement." The Huguenots, who, driven from France, had escaped to England, found on English soil not simply a cordial welcome, but the freedom of worship deemed accursed at Rome, and the pope called upon Elizabeth to close the ports of England to the Huguenots, whom he denounced as "drunkards and sectarians." The duplicity of Elizabeth leaves no room for eulogy on her vacillating and treacherous policy towards the Huguenots, but the open reply of Bishop Jewel to the pope's demand, while memorable as exhibiting the spirit of an English bishop resenting an affront

to the English sovereign and the English people, remains as a notable tribute to the Huguenots who had found a refuge in Great Britain.

The bishop referred with frankness to the notorious character of thousands of the residents of Rome, and desired to know whether, if the pope was to be allowed to entertain such "servants of the devil," the Queen of England was to be denied the liberty of receiving "a few servants of God." "They are," he continued, "our brethren; they live not idle. If they have houses they pay rent for them. They hold not our ground, but by making due recompense. They beg not in our streets, nor crave anything at our hands, but to breathe our air and see our sun. They are good examples of virtue, travail, faith, and patience; the towns in which they live are happy, for God doth follow them with his blessings." Other references to the Huguenots in Great Britain are equally suggestive as to their character and progressive action, and they are the more striking when we remember that they brought neither money nor the material means that are generally deemed necessary for prosperity. But they brought intelligence, skill, virtue, and the spirit of independence; they were men of convictions, earnest and courageous, and so faithful to their word that even in France, among those not of their faith, it became a proverb, "as honest as a Huguenot."

Sir Henry Sidney, in his memoir of the government in Ireland in 1590, says, "I caused to plant and inhabit there about forty families of the Reformed Church of the Low Countries, flying thence for religion's sake, in one ruinous town called Swords; and truly, sir, it would have done any man good to have seen how diligently they wrought, how they re-edified the quite spoiled old castle of the same town, and repaired almost all the same, and how godly and cleanly they and their wives lived." The advantages that they brought even to decayed old towns seem to have accompanied them wherever they settled. Bishop Parkhurst, in referring to the revival of Norwich under Huguenot influence, declared his persuasion that "these blessings from God have happened by reason of the godly exiles who were here so kindly harbored."

THE HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF GERMANY.

The Huguenot Society of Germany, which seems to have held preliminary meetings at London and Bremen, held its second General Assembly at Berlin on December 11, 12, and 13, 1892, in accordance with the notice in its organ, *The French Colony*, and a note of its progress will interest not simply the American descendants, but the German Huguenots in our Republic.

It is said that from 1524 to 1740 there were established in Germany some two hundred Huguenot colonies, of which about one-fourth were in Prussia.

By the wise statesmanship of the Elector Frederick William, the Province of Brandenburg, which had been desolated by the Thirty Years' War, was early offered as a home to the Huguenots, with the promise of liberty of worship, protection, and hospitality. As early as 1661 many refugees settled at Berlin and founded a French church, and the Edict of Paris was followed by that of Potsdam, offering a safe retreat, facilities, and other advantages, in order to relieve them, and in some sort of way to make amends for the calamities with which Providence thought fit to visit so considerable a portion of the church (Smiles, 213, 214). Soon every large town in Prussia had its French church and one or more French pastors (p. 214).

The immigrants included soldiers, gentlemen, men of letters, artists, traders, manufacturers, and workmen, and Weiss says that they all received assistance, and "they contributed in their turn, in a proportion very superior to their numbers, to the greatness of their adopted country." Large progress has already been made in recording the personal history and particulars of the Huguenots who settled in Prussia, in a work published in Berlin by Messrs. Erman & Reclam, entitled "Mémoire pour servir à l'Histoire des Refugiés François dans les États du Roi" (Smiles, 215).

The Huguenot Association of Germany, founded at Friedrichsdorf, September 29, 1890, has already more than five hundred paying members, with a library of two hundred and

thirteen volumes; and it proposes to publish yearly twelve historical pamphlets till the history of the two hundred Huguenot churches has been written.

Some twenty-one presbyteries of Huguenot churches have joined the Association, which, with four branches, embraces twenty-five Huguenot corporations.

At the Berlin assemblage, in December last, Pastor Robert, of Frankfort, the first speaker, said: "The purpose of the Association is to preserve, keep, and cherish in the descendants the spirit of their forefathers. They were loyal to the emperor and the great German fatherland, as all other citizens, but on religious grounds they remained true to their traditions." After this sermon, delivered in the Church of the Consistoire Française, "the Friedrichstadt church," the meeting adjourned to the Brandenburg House, where a reception and welcome was extended to the delegates. The hall was decorated with frescos illustrating the history of the Berlin French colony, and with the statues of the Hohenzollerns. Pastor Lorenz, of Berlin, spoke on behalf of the local committees, and Preacher Nessler, of Berlin, for the Consistoire Française. Banker de Neufeille brought greetings from the French Reformed Church at Frankfort, Pastor Kepp-Perouse those from Wurtemberg, Pastor Dr. Rud. Koch, of Butzow, those from Mecklenburg, Pastor Hapke, those from the Bohemian Church, etc. Dr. Beringuier returned thanks on behalf of the committee. The next meeting was held in the session-room of the Consistoire Française, Wednesday, October 12, at 10 A.M. Dr. Tollin presided, and reviewed the purposes of the German Huguenot Association, and the results.

Last year, at the meeting of the Reformed Union of Germany, it was said that "the history of the Huguenots was the most beautiful leaf in the history of Protestantism."

The very valuable service already rendered to the history of the Huguenots in Germany, especially by Dr. Henry Tollin, and the earnest spirit exhibited by his Association, indicate that the beautiful work they are proposing to complete will be one of interest not to Germany alone, but that, in developing the influence of the Huguenots on Germany, it will be throwing

new light upon the history of Europe, and upon the extent to which the Huguenot element has been a factor in the advance of Christian civilization.

The completeness of history, as a whole, is an idea as yet but imperfectly comprehended, but German scholars have taken the lead in developing the true philosophy of history, and suggesting improved methods for its development in schools and colleges, which have been adopted by the most learned bodies of Europe, England, and the United States; and perhaps no subject could be found of wider and deeper interest as a subject of philosophic treatment than the result of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, in bringing to other lands in such large measure high intelligence, industry, virtue, sound political ideas, and the charm of refined manners; emigrants who have left descendants with an honorable record in the theological, scientific, and literary progress of the countries to which they went. It is no longer sufficient to know that the intelligence of the age and the better opinion of France itself holds that the Revocation was a moral crime, a political blunder, and a national disaster, that it was the remote cause of the French Revolution, with its awful defiance of God and man. What we now desire to know more fully is the extent to which the dispersion of the Huguenots, with their well-known principles and characteristics, has contributed, not simply in England and America, but in every country whither they went, to elevate social character and material prosperity, to advance the progress of true Christianity, of civil and religious freedom, and of the happiness of mankind.

The promised sketches of the Huguenot churches in Germany, relating to the coming and progress of the French refugees, should gradually develop the personal traits and biographical details that constitute so important a part of practical life, and which shape and explain, to so large an extent, however unconsciously, the public policy and events; and those personal traits in the Huguenots, whether owing to race, heredity, or habit, were so strongly marked that amid the mutations of the centuries as they pass they can be readily recognized.

Even in features of lesser importance, Dr. Baird, for instance,

remarks that "the Huguenots who went to Boston carried with them a buoyancy and a cheerfulness, with a modesty and pliancy in things not vitally important, a love of the beautiful, and a devotion to liberty, so that the historian notes their influence as shown in such names as Bowdoin, Faneuil, and Revere upon social and public life and typical character." (Baird, II., 254). Touching their vitality and their power of endurance and ability to meet the most difficult circumstances, Smiles says, "For more than a century the Protestants had neither right nor privilege nor a vestige of liberty, for they were placed entirely beyond the pale of the law" (Smiles, p. 434).

If the Protestants were not stamped wholly out of existence, at least in many cases they were stamped out of sight, and if they contrived to worship it was in secret only, in caves among the hills in the desert. And Dr. Schaff says, "The resurrection of the Huguenot Church and its continuance for a hundred years, in spite of legal prohibition and systematic persecution by the state, is a marvel without a parallel in history except in the Church of the first three centuries."

It was this marvellous strength of character, so strikingly exhibited in the siege of La Rochelle, so forcibly illustrating the olden maxim "Stand like a beaten anvil," which gave to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes enduring and world-wide significance, in its effect upon France, on the one hand, and the nations who received the Huguenots, on the other; tending, as has been said, to illustrate the divine unity of the human race and the divine continuity of history.

The massacre of the Waldenses in Italy, of the Walloons in Flanders, of St. Bartholomew, and the dragonnades in France were events that concerned not merely the Waldenses, the Walloons, and Huguenots, not merely those who were murdered and those who were exiled, not merely Philip, Alva, and Torquemada, Louis XIV. and his papal advisers, not merely Spain and France, the Holy Office and the court of Rome, but they involved questions of humanity and of right, they concerned the world at large, and all Christian and civilized people. In their gigantic results, extending through the ages, they touched every government and all mankind.

Of the effect on France Dr. Charles Baird remarks, and the most thoughtful writers, like Martin, Berdier, and Weiss, share his opinion, that "France rejected the Reformation and reaped the Revolution." Dr. Baird found in the repressive policy of France, as shown in the religious intolerance which excluded the Huguenots from New France in America, another stupendous blunder, fraught with disaster to the French colonial system in America, by staying emigration from the countries of northern Europe and the British colonies of America, and thus losing the intelligence and the moral worth that might have enriched the French possessions and procured to their fatherland a vast domain upon the North American continent.

The light thrown by the persecution of the Huguenots by Spain and France, upon the fate of those kingdoms, is in each case very striking, and it was not without reason that the defeat of the Invincible Armada was hailed by the Huguenots in England with devout thanksgiving.

When, in 1588, Philip II. launched his Sacred Armada against England, with one hundred and thirty ships, besides transports, two thousand six hundred and fifty great guns, thirty-three thousand soldiers and sailors, besides one hundred and eighty priests and monks under a General of the Holy Inquisition; and this Invincible Armada was, as Smiles says, "shattered by the ships of Drake, Hawkins, and Howard, and finally scattered by the tempest of the Almighty" (p. 93): an entry in the records of "God's Home" at Southampton shows that "on the 29th of November, 1588, thanks were publicly rendered to Almighty God for the wonderful dispersion of the Spanish fleet, which had descended upon the coast of England with the object of conquering the kingdom and bringing it under the tyranny of the pope."

The fitness of that thanksgiving, and the sincerity with which it was offered, are accentuated by the fact mentioned by Smiles, that the Armada "was furnished with chains and instruments of torture, and with smiths to set them to work, destined for the punishment of the pestilent heretics who had so long defied the power of Spain" (p. 91).

But the thought which gives to the defeat of the Armada

its grand significance in history is the thought of the change its success would have wrought in arresting the progress of civil and religious freedom, and subjecting Great Britain, and perhaps northern Europe, to the despotism, superstition, and barbarism typified by Spain, Alva, and the Inquisition.

The historic reminders of the vitality and endurance of the Huguenots, based upon their undying faith, may well be recalled to stimulate the hope now confidently expressed, that that faith is being widely revived in France by the missions recently established, chiefly by earnest American women, aided by friends in England, Scotland, and Canada.*

This movement naturally recalls the friendly relations of France and our Republic in the past, when French aid, however mingled the motives that prompted it, and however limited at the close by the complicated policy of the Bourbon courts, was of material and essential service by land and sea in securing at Yorktown our national independence.

That debt will be more than repaid if from our Republic in its strength France shall be inspired and aided to revive among her people the immortal truths which the Huguenots upheld.

We can cordially bid God speed to the Huguenot Society of Germany.

Germany and its church historians may be assured that whatever new and useful light their work will throw on the diplomacy, the statesmanship, and the governmental policy, reformatory or reactionary, of succeeding periods, it will result in new developments of the noble and Christian traits of the Huguenot emigrants and the blessings that followed in their path.

Turning from the work of our German brothers to our own, I need not say that I heartily approve of the recent action of

---

* The reports of the American Branch of the McAll Mission show that in 1890 it had seventy auxiliaries, composed of members of the Presbyterian, Episcopal, Dutch Reformed, Baptist, Congregational, Methodist, and Reformed Episcopal churches. That the American contributions from April, 1891, to April, 1892, amounted to $42,200.67; that the total attendance of children at the Sunday-schools and children's meetings in charge of the Mission near Paris and in other parts of France was, in 1890, 234,892. It was said also at Exeter Hall that 19,000 sittings were placed night by night for the working classes ("McAll Record," p. 26).

the Executive Committee in calling for a Special Committee to consider and report upon the best means for increasing the membership and widening the influence of our Society; and I congratulate you on the acceptance of that duty by the distinguished and earnest members of our Society whose report is now before you. There seems no reason to doubt that the measures suggested are all in accord with the interest and aims of the Society, and will tend to facilitate their accomplishment.

The generous courtesy of Columbia College, in giving us fireproof alcoves in that venerable institution for our books and manuscripts, confers a favor that commands our best thanks.

The report contemplates a room for the Society, furnished with portraits and reminders of eminent Huguenots, in charge of a competent paid assistant, qualified for our French and German correspondence, and a reasonable publication fund, which will be essential to the fair development of the scheme; with an increase of members throughout the Republic; with the collection and preservation of Huguenot records, genealogies, and memoirs, which have been so long neglected; and the publication at regular intervals of valuable papers relating to their history. The enlargement of the scope of Huguenot inquiry by the formation of foreign societies seems fairly to demand from the Huguenot Society of America a cordial response to the world-wide interest felt in historic justice to our ancestry of a common faith. Assuming that the proposition of the committee will meet your approval and be promptly carried into operation, I beg to suggest that should our library correspond in completeness with our advanced plans, it will afford new and most important advantages to our country for the study of Huguenot history.

Among the standard works which it should possess are the volumes, more than thirty in number, of the "Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français," edited by M. Henry Berdier, and now passing through a second edition; and the local histories of Protestantism in the towns of France; and also the series of volumes published at home under governmental auspices, comprising documents relating to the colonial history of New York.

Then, too, with the inestimable advantage of fireproof protection, we are able to offer a reliable and convenient place of deposit for ancient documents, papers, and relics, which the owners may often be glad to place for permanent preservation and general utility with less danger of destruction or injury than in the constant mutation of private homes. Some idea may be formed of the valuable papers in personal hands, and probably capable of access, from the preface of our much lamented friend, Dr. Charles Baird, whose admirable volumes on the "History of Huguenot Emigration to America" he had proposed to complete in future volumes on the Huguenot settlement in the Middle and Southern States, and for which he had already received from numerous sources, personal and associate, the cordial aid which he thankfully acknowledged, and a mere reference to which gives some idea of the unexplored or but partially explored historic material that still awaits the judicious collation and fair treatment of true historians. Dr. Baird's preface gives the names of persons and associations with whom the Committee on Papers and Publication may find it convenient to correspond, unless the hope is to be fulfilled which has been earnestly entertained, that Dr. Henry M. Baird will continue and complete his brother's work, as one already advanced and of national importance. That gentleman will doubtless be ready to favor the committee with his advice and assistance.

THE CHURCH RECORD OF NEW PALTZ.

The volume now in preparation of the records of the Huguenot Church at New Paltz is proposed as the next of our publications, and will have an interest of its own, as it connects us with the little colony of the Walloons, who, flying before the troops of Alva, had gone to the Palatinate near Mannheim, and from there had come first to New Amsterdam and then (1660) to a spot on the west side of the Hudson, known to the Dutch from the earliest times as Esopus, and where a Dutch fort had been erected at Rondout, now part of Kingston, in 1614. The struggle with the Indians, known as the Esopus War, was

supposed to be over, although it was for a time renewed; and in the beautiful valley of the Wallkill, near the base of the Shawangunk Mountains and the range of the Catskills, the little colony headed by Louis Du Bois, recalling their exile on the Rhine, named the village "Le Nouveau Palatinate," or New Paltz.

It has been suggested that our Society might make a summer visit to New Paltz, such a visit as was so pleasantly and usefully made a few years ago to New Rochelle.

ELIAS BOUDINOT: REMINISCENCES OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.*

By the Rev. W. Wallace Atterbury, D.D.

In the Surrogate's office in this city is an old French will, written in the year 1700. In it the writer speaks of having been compelled to abandon his native land to escape the continual persecution which came upon him for his profession of faith in the Gospel. He declares that he wishes to live and die in the faith of the Reformed religion, in which, by the grace of God, he had been reared. He then proceeds to distribute his property—no inconsiderable sum—to his children, and goes on to provide for the further distribution of such estates as he has been compelled to leave behind him in his native land, "if," to use his own words, "it shall please God, as I pray with all my heart, to establish in France the liberty of our holy religion, and my children return thither."

It is well, perhaps, for some of us who honor him as a progenitor that his prayer was not answered.

His name was Elie Boudinot. He came from Aunis, the smallest of the thirty-three provinces into which the kingdom of France was at that time divided, and which has been called the birthplace of American Huguenots. The province was scarcely more than a suburb of the seaport La Rochelle, which had been the stronghold of the Huguenot faith and fighting for nearly seventy years, and which, though dismantled and spoiled of its ancient honors, was still the home of many of their wealthiest and most influential families. The home of the Boudinots was eleven miles northeast of La Rochelle, in the town of Marans, famous in the wars of the League. Completely surrounded by water or by salt marshes, it formed a picturesque island, approached only from the southeast by a causeway. Taken by the forces of the Duke of Guise in 1588,

* Read before the Huguenot Society, February 15, 1894.

Marans was retaken by Henry of Navarre after the battle of Coutras. The story is told that when the Huguenot army was about to advance to the assault of this place the troops kneeled down, according to their custom, in prayer; the Roman Catholic soldiers, witnessing this procedure, exclaimed, "They are praying to God; now they will beat us, just as they did at Coutras."

Here the family of the Boudinots had flourished for several generations, and the name frequently occurs in the old registers of the Reformed Church of Marans, preserved in the archives of the church at La Rochelle, to which parish it now belongs. A manuscript history of this church, deposited in the Protestant Library of Paris, where a few years ago I had the opportunity of looking over it, gives an interesting record of the persecutions to which, through the middle and latter part of the seventeenth century, the Huguenots there were subjected. Le sieur Helie Boudinot (as he is called in these records) was a merchant of ample means and eminent standing, an elder of the Huguenot church. His name occurs more than once in the records of judicial prosecutions against him for adhering to his faith. In one instance the intendant of the town reports that, suspecting a violation of the law which prohibited any Huguenot family from employing private tutors, he visited the house of Helie Boudinot, and there in an upper story found a refugee engaged in the instruction of his children, whom he forthwith arrested.

Immediately upon the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, Boudinot, whose wife, Jeanne Baraud, had died a few years before, escaped with his family to London with such property as he could carry with him, leaving the rest of his substance in the care of a nephew who remained in France. Here, on the 20th of March, 1686, with his children, he obtained letters of denization from King James II. Among the names of other Huguenots who were naturalized on the same day occurs that of Estienne De Lancey, ancestor of the honored Vice-President of the Society, who occupies the chair this evening.

Another Boudinot, presumably of the same family, came to England about the same time, and was a lieutenant in the

famous regiment of horse under the command of the Duke of Schomberg, which did distinguished service in Ireland under William of Orange, where its commander, described as the ablest general of his time in Europe, was killed at the battle of the Boyne.

Elie Boudinot made but a brief stay in London, but long enough to marry there, November 2, 1686, Suzanne Papin, widow of Benjamin d'Harriette. Early in the year 1687 we find him with his family in New York, where he united with Mr. Peiret in organizing the Huguenot church, of which he became the first elder. The first entry in the records of this church is of a baptism, in November, 1688, with the signatures of Elie Boudinot, elder, and Estienne De Lancey, deacon, as witnesses. It is estimated that at this time there were some two hundred Huguenot families in New York alone. The old church stood, as you know, on what was called Pettycoat Lane, on the ground now covered by the Produce Exchange. Mr. Boudinot early became involved with other citizens of New York in the conflict with Governor Leisler. His name appears in a protest addressed to William and Mary, soon after their accession to the throne, with that of other "Protestant and principal inhabitants and traders of their Majesties' province of New York," complaining of cruel ecclesiastical oppression.

I must pass over many interesting incidents connected with Mr. Boudinot and his immediate descendants, as these genealogical notices are merely introductory to what is the main topic of this paper. He died in the year 1702.

His son Elie, who had come with his father from Marans, and seems to have been the only surviving child at this time of his father's first marriage, was about thirty years old at his father's death. He had married (September 10, 1699) the daughter of Louis Carré, a friend of his father's, who had emigrated from France about the same time. He followed closely in his father's steps, and early became an elder and supporter of the Huguenot Church. In 1705 his name appears on a petition of merchants of New York, addressed to Lord Cornbury, for the regulation of the commercial currency of that day. In his will, dated in 1719, after expressing his faith and

hope in Christ, he disposes of his property, consisting in part of copper-mines, lands, and buildings in Sunbury, Connecticut, and of lands, tenements, etc., in the colonies of New York and New Jersey, and then directs his executors "to pursue in law Jacob Brenton, of Rhode Island, for 100 pounds allowed me by arbitrators between us chosen, for which I have bond and award," etc.—an illustration, perhaps, of the obstinate persistency which has been said to characterize the Boudinots of a later generation.

His only surviving son also bore the name of Elias. He was educated in New York, his native city, and, it is said, was designed by his parents for the Christian ministry, but in 1728, when but twenty-one years of age, we find him in the island of Antigua, where a brother of his father had long resided.

Here he married Katherine Williams, the daughter of a Welsh planter, and afterwards removed to Philadelphia. The family subsequently transferred their home to New Jersey. In the ancient burial-ground of the First Presbyterian Church of Elizabeth (where the mother of this Elias, Marie Carré, lived for many years after her husband's death) stand two unpretending monuments, one with this inscription: "M. S. of paternal affection and universal benevolence, this monument is erected by filial affection to testify to after ages that here lies the body of Elias Boudinot, who died July 4th, 1770, aged 63 years.

> "This modest stone, what few vain marbles can,
> May truly say, here lies an honest man."

On the other monument is a similar inscription: "Sacred to the memory of Katherine, wife of Elias Boudinot, who departed this life Nov. 1, 1765, aged 61 years; in testimony of whose maternal affection and pious care this monument is erected by her grateful children."

Among his children was one who, called after his father, was the fourth who bore the name Elias. As he is the one of whom I am to speak more particularly this evening, let me briefly indicate the chief features of his life. He was born in Philadelphia in 1740, and was baptized by the Rev. George

Whitefield. He studied law at Princeton with Richard Stockton, signer of the Declaration of Independence, who had married Boudinot's sister. Licensed in 1760, at the age of twenty, he commenced the practice of law at Elizabethtown, where two years afterward he married Hannah, the sister of Richard Stockton. He was attached to the First Presbyterian Church, in connection with which he was made president of its board of trustees when only twenty-five years of age. He early devoted himself to the cause of his country, and was in the midst of a successful legal practice, and rapidly laying the foundation of his subsequent patriotic and moral eminence, when hostility to the mother country began to ripen into overt acts of resistance. Elizabethtown was at this time the home of William Peartree Smith, William Livingston, and other eminent Jersey men who took active part in the stirring strife of the time, and through them it became the centre of the patriotic movement throughout New Jersey.

In 1772 Boudinot was made a trustee of Princeton College, a position which he held for fifty years, until his death. Early in 1775 he was chairman of the Committee of Safety at Elizabeth. Soon afterwards he was chosen a member of what was called the Provincial Congress of New Jersey, which took the control of the State of New Jersey out of the hands of the Tory Governor Franklin. In company with William Peartree Smith he was sent by this body to the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, to confer as to what course it was best to take in New Jersey.

In April, 1777, he was appointed commissary-general of prisoners in the American army, with the additional duty of superintending the intelligence department of the army. The position brought him into very intimate relations with the commander-in-chief. He held this position until, in 1778, he took his seat as a member of the Continental Congress. In November, 1782, he was chosen president of Congress, in which capacity he signed the treaty of peace with Great Britain. At the close of the war he resumed the practice of law in Elizabeth. On the organization of the United States Supreme Court in New York, February, 1789, his name was

the first entered on the roll of counsellors admitted to practise before it. On the reëstablishment of Congress he was elected a member of the House of Representatives, where he sat from 1789 to 1795. He was then appointed by Washington director of the Mint, which office he held for ten years, when he resigned and retired to private life at Burlington, New Jersey, with his only child, the widow of William Bradford who had been attorney-general under Washington. He was at this time sixty-five years of age, and here he passed the rest of his life in literary and benevolent work, and in the exercise of a liberal and elegant hospitality. He helped to lay the foundations of the American Bible Society, was made its first president, gave it an endowment of $10,000—a very large sum for those days—and afterwards contributed to the erection of the first Bible House. He died in 1821, aged eighty-one. During the early years of his public life, from his rank in the army, he bore the title of colonel. After receiving the honorary degree of LL.D. from Yale College in 1790, he was usually addressed as Dr. Boudinot.

Mr. Boudinot had carefully kept copies of his correspondence and other memoranda, and so it was that during these later years he prepared a manuscript journal or record of some of the incidents of the revolutionary period which had come under his personal knowledge. In the introductory note of this journal he says: "A great many interesting anecdotes which happened during the American revolutionary war are likely to be lost to posterity by the negligence of the parties concerned, in not recording them, so that in future time they may be resorted to as throwing great light on the eventful crisis of this important era. I shall therefore, without any attention to order, but merely as they arise in my memory, set down those I have had any acquaintance with, attending principally to the truth of the facts."

It is from this interesting record that I propose to read to you some extracts.* I may say that I have in nearly every

* This valuable MS. is now in possession of John Nicholas Brown, Esq., of Providence, R. I., to whose generous courtesy we are indebted for this use of it.

case compared the statements of this journal with the published history of the times, and while they often throw new light upon the incidents referred to, I have found in them no discrepancy with the facts of authenticated history.

Mr. Boudinot speaks of himself as among the earliest of the citizens of New Jersey who exerted themselves in opposition to the unconstitutional acts of the mother country, to which the Americans were bound by the strongest habits of filial affection and religious obedience. "Nothing was further from our ideas [he says] than a state of independence. I had read a treatise by some English writer which in a very extraordinary manner foretold the certainty of American independence in some future day, but we talked of it and treated it as most people do now the accounts they read of the millennium."

The first entry in the journal brings vividly before us what Kossuth described as "the opening scene of a revolution destined to change the character of governments and the condition of the human race."

As already mentioned, Mr. Boudinot early in 1775 was chairman of the Committee of Safety at Elizabethtown. On April 19 occurred the battle of Lexington. You know the familiar story. The British, in possession of Boston, determined to capture certain rebel supplies stored at Concord, and especially to seize Hancock and Samuel Adams, who were at Lexington. Picketing the roads that led out of Boston, so that no intelligence of their movements should be had, on the evening of April 18 they sent out a detachment of troops to make the seizure. But in those stirring times everybody was on the alert. The very first movement of the troops was made known by preconcerted signal. Paul Revere rowed across to the Charlestown shore, mounted his horse, and made his famous ride to rouse the threatened villages and towns. On Lexington Green, at daybreak of April 19, occurred the skirmish, which can scarcely be called a battle. Here, in the journal, is a copy of the alarm sent out by the Committee of Watertown, which was the headquarters of the rebels, to raise the country, a few hours after.

"Copy of the alarm sent by the Committee of Watertown, near Boston, to raise the country, received by me as chairman of the Committee of Safety at Elizabeth Town, in the evening of 23d of April, 1775.

WATERTOWN, Wednesday morning, near 11 o'clock.

"To all friends of American liberty, be it known, that this morning before break of day, a Brigade, consisting of about 1,000 or 1,200 men, landed at Phipp's Farm at Cambridge and marched to Lexington, where they found a company of our militia in arms, upon whom they fired without any provocation and killed 6 men and wounded 4 others. By an express from Boston we find another Brigade are now upon their march from Boston, supposed to be about 1,000 men. The Bearer, Israel Bissel, is charged to alarm the Country quite to Connecticut, and all Persons are desired to furnish him with fresh horses, as they may be needed. I have spoken with several who have seen the dead and wounded.

"J. PALMER,
One of the Committee of Safety.

Forwarded from Worcester, April 19, 1775.

Brooklyn,	Thursday,	11 o'clock.
Norwich,	"	4 o'clock.
New London,	"	7 o'clock.
Lynne,	Friday morning,	1 o'clock.
Say Brook,	"	4 o'clock.
Killingworth,	"	7 o'clock.
E. Guilford,	"	8 o'clock.
Guilford,	"	10 o'clock.
Branford,	"	12 o'clock.

New Haven, April 21.

Received and forwarded on certain intelligence, Fairfield, April 22, 8 o'clock."

What a picture does this brief memorandum suggest! The trusty messenger, speeding from town to town, stopping only to tell the news, to change his horse, and get needed food, and to snatch, perhaps, a few hours' sleep as night overtakes him. Down through Massachusetts and Connecticut, along the shore, through New Haven and Fairfield, and on to

New York, until, on Sunday evening, the message is read to the group of eager and sympathizing patriots at Elizabeth; and then, when the chairman of the Committee of Safety has made a rapid copy of it and added his endorsement, the messenger hastens with it on his way to Philadelphia.*

On June 15 Washington was chosen commander-in-chief by the Continental Congress, and started at once for Massachusetts. On his way, at New York, June 17, he heard of the battle of Bunker Hill; on July 30 he took command of the patriot forces at Cambridge.

A brief extract from the journal gives us a glimpse of some of the difficulties that at once confronted him:

"When our Army lay before Boston in 1775 our powder was so nearly expended that General Washington told me that he had not more than eight rounds a man, although he had then near fourteen miles of line to guard, and that he dare not give an evening or morning gun. In this situation one of the Committee of Safety for Massachusetts, who was privy to the whole secret, deserted and went over to General Gage, and discovered our poverty to him. The fact was so incredible that General Gage treated it as a stratagem of war, and the informant as a spy, or coming with the express purpose of deceiving him and drawing his army into a snare, by which means we were saved from having our quarters beaten up. I was the Chairman of the Committee of Safety at Elizabeth Town, and had about six or seven quarter casks of powder, which, on urgent application from General Washington, were sent to Boston, with what could be spared from New York."

But though blood had been shed on both sides, the colonists claimed still to be loyal to the mother country, and hoped for the redress of their grievances. A year would pass before the country was ripe for independence. Each step in the way of resistance needed to be taken with caution. It was a time for cool heads as well as for brave hearts. And that the young Boudinot had both, an incident or two will show:

---

* The original despatch is preserved in the rooms of the Historical Society of Philadelphia. See an interesting paper on "The Early New York Post-office," in the *Magazine of American History*, February, 1885, by the Rev. A. G. Vermilye, D.D.

"In 1775 I was chosen a member of the Provincial Congress of New Jersey, and when a proposition was made by a few weak and violent men for raising a regiment of troops, it was opposed by all the men of note and understanding, as a measure wholly against our duty of allegiance to Great Britain, and rejected as contrary to every sentiment or desire of our constituents. A few weak, violent men (particularly a William Smith of Woodbridge) were not only for raising a regiment of soldiers, but expressly moved for an order to burn every man's house who should refuse to join in the opposition. It required prudence and patience to get rid of the effects of these hot-headed measures. But I could not help remarking that these very men were the first to join the enemy as soon as they appeared in force.

MEETING AT NEW BRUNSWICK—DR. JOHN WITHERSPOON.

"In 1776, in the month of April, an invitation was given in the newspaper of New Jersey (but without a name) for each county to choose delegates or a committee to meet at New Brunswick, on matters which greatly concerned the province. As it was understood to be designed to promote some general plan relative to a market for home manufactures in each county, committees were generally appointed, although the publication made but little impression on the minds of the people at large. At this time the stated meeting of the Trustees of the College of New Jersey was held at Princeton. Being one of the trustees, I attended, but we were surprised to find our president, the Rev. Dr. John Witherspoon, had absented himself on the second day of our meeting.

"We finished our business, and the next day I was returning home, without reflecting at all on the meeting to be held at New Brunswick, having totally forgotten it. In company with William P. Smith, Esq., another of the trustees, arrived at New Brunswick about 11 o'clock A.M. and after feeding our horses meant to have dined at Woodbridge. In the meantime an acquaintance from the County of Bergen came into the tavern. He informed us that he was one of the committee from that county; that Dr. Witherspoon had met the united committees, and acknowledged himself the author of the publication, and informed them that the design of the meeting was to consider the peculiar situation of the province, and the propriety of declaring a separation from Great Britain, and forming an independent Constitution for ourselves: and as he did not wish to precipitate so important a step, he proposed

adjourning till the afternoon, when he would offer his reason at large, and in the meantime each member might think seriously on the subject. This unexpected account raised our curiosity, and Mr. Smith and myself agreed to stay and hear what might be said on the subject. Before the meeting adjourned they resolved that, as the subject was one which interested every inhabitant of the province, any of the audience might come forward and deliver his sentiments, although he could not vote on the question.

"We accordingly attended the meeting in the afternoon when Dr. W. rose, and in a very able and elegant speech of one hour and a half endeavored to convince the audience and the committee of the absurdity of opposing the extravagant demands of Great Britain, while we were professing a perfect allegiance to her authority and supporting her courts of justice. The character of the speaker, his great influence among the people, his known attachment to the liberties of the people, and the artful manner in which he represented the whole subject as worthy their attention had an effect on the assembly that astonished me.

"There appeared a general approbation of the measure, and I strongly suspected an universal acquiescence of both committees and audience in approving the doctor's scheme. I never felt myself in a more mortifying situation. The anonymous publication; the meeting of the trustees of the college but the day before, made up wholly of Presbyterians; their president leaving them to attend the meeting and avowing himself the author of it; the doctor known to be at the head of the Presbyterian interest, and Mr. Smith and myself both Presbyterians, arriving at New Brunswick in the morning, as if intending to go forward, and then staying and attending the meeting, altogether looked so like a preconcerted scheme to accomplish the end, that I was at my wit's end to know how to extricate myself from so disagreeable a situation, especially as the measure was totally against my judgment.

"On a minute's conversation with Mr. Smith, I determined at all events to step forward and bare my testimony against the scheme *in toto*. Two of the committee had delayed the question by speaking in favor of it, but no one had spoken in opposition till I rose, and in a speech of about half an hour or better, stated my peculiar situation, and endeavored to show the fallacy of the doctor's arguments; that his plan was neither founded in wisdom, prudence, nor economy; that we had chosen a Continental Congress to whom we had resigned the consideration of our public affairs; that they, coming from every part of the Union, would best represent all the colonies now thus united; they

would know the true situation of our country with regard to finances, union, and the prospects we had of a happy reconciliation with the mother country; they would also be possessed of our relative circumstances with regard to the other nations of Europe; in short, that they were the only proper judges of the measures to be pursued, and that we had no right to involve them in distress and trouble by plunging ourselves into measures of so delicate a nature, until they should advise us in what manner to proceed, etc., etc.

"This opposition, wholly unexpected by the doctor, with the great attention of all present, a little disconcerted him, but he soon recovered himself, and began a reply, when two or three gentlemen of the audience came to me and desired that I would inform the doctor that if he proceeded any farther they would not be answerable for his safety. I answered, that the request was an unreasonable one; that I had been the only person present who had opposed him; that he had a right to be heard in reply, and if they disliked the proposition, they ought openly to come forward and to give their opinions.

"The doctor had not spoken twenty minutes when I observed some person whispering to him. He directly stopped, informed the chairman that he found that he was giving offence, and therefore he should say no more on the subject, but hoped that the committees would return to their respective counties and consult their constituents, without coming to any determination on the subject.

"To this I objected, urging the impropriety of breaking up without a vote, as in that case the opinion of the meeting would be variously reported in the different counties, according to each man's political creed, and the people would by these means be led astray.

"The doctor was a good deal out of humor, and contended warmly against a vote; but a large majority of the meeting insisted on a vote, which, being taken, out of thirty-six members there were but three or four who voted for the doctor's proposition, the rest rejecting it with great warmth. Thus ended this final attempt to try the pulse of the people of New Jersey on the subject of independence, and yet, when advised by the Continental Congress, no part of the Union was more hearty than the State of New Jersey."

During the months that preceded and followed the Declaration of Independence, Boudinot was actively engaged in various capacities in promoting the patriot cause. It was not till the following year that he entered the military service, and

came into those close relations with Washington which lasted until the death of the latter.

The following entry in the journal tells us how it came about, and incidentally throws light both upon his own character and that of his illustrious chief.

APPOINTMENT AS COMMISSARY-GENERAL OF PRISONERS.

"In the spring of 1777 General Washington wrote me from Morristown a letter, requesting me to accept of a commission as commissary-general of prisoners in the army of America. I waited on him and politely declined the task, urging the wants of the prisoners and having nothing to supply them. He very kindly objected to the conduct of gentlemen of the country refusing to join him in his arduous struggle; that he had nothing in view but the salvation of his country, but it was impossible for him to accomplish it alone; that if men of character and influence would not come forward and join him in his exertions all would be lost. Affected by this address and supposing that I could be of some service to the prisoners and at the same time have an eye on the military power, and prevent its encroachments on the civil authority, I consented to accept the commission, on the general's assurance that I should be supplied by the secret committee of Congress with hard money for the relief of prisoners, and that I should only be subject to his orders, in the conduct of my department.

"Soon after I had entered on my department, the applications of the prisoners were so numerous, and their distresses so urgent, that I exerted every nerve to obtain supplies, but in vain. Excepting £600 I had received from the secret committee in bills of exchange, at my first entrance into the office, I could not by any means get a farthing more, except in continental money, which was of no avail in New York. I applied to the general, describing my delicate situation and the continual application of the officers, painting their extreme distress, and urging the assurance they had received that on my appointment I was to be furnished with adequate means for their full relief. The general appeared greatly distressed, and assured me that it was out of his power to afford me any supplies. I proposed drawing clothing from the public stores, but to this he objected, as not having anything like a sufficient supply for the army. He urged my considering and adopting the best means in my power to satisfy the

necessities of the prisoners, and he would confirm them. I told him I knew of no means in my power but to take what moneys I had of my own and to borrow from my friends in New York, to accomplish the desirable purpose. He greatly encouraged me to the attempt, promising me that if I finally met with any loss, he would divide it with me. On this I began to afford them some supplies of provision over and above what the enemy afforded them, which was very small and very indifferent."

The young commissary-general had some lessons to learn, and seems to have had sense enough to learn them. Here is an incident in point:

"In 1777 General Lincoln was surprised just at the dawn of day in his quarters at Bound Brook, by Lord Cornwallis, who had marched from Brunswick, passed his sentinels, captured or destroyed his main guard, and was at the general's quarters before he knew anything of it. He had but just time to escape out of a back door. Several men were killed and one or two pieces of ordnance taken. It was some time a mystery how this had been effected with so much secrecy; till I was well informed by a gentleman of note who was with the enemy at Brunswick, that a certain farmer, whose name he mentioned, and who lived in the midst of our camp, had communicated to Lord Cornwallis our countersign, by which he had accomplished his intentions. My spirit was very much roused against this traitor; and with great zeal I went to General Washington with the information, stating the substance of it, but keeping back the name of my informant, as he had assured me his life depended on my prudence and faithfulness to him. I urged the general's orders to seize the culprit without delay and make an example of him. The general did not immediately answer me, on which I repeated my request. He then said, 'Did not you tell me that the life of your informant depended on your secrecy? Would you take up a citizen and confine him without letting him know his crime and his accuser? No, let him alone for the present, watch him carefully, and if you can catch him in any other crime, so as to confront him by witnesses, we will then punish him severely.' My mortification was very great, to think that I, who had entered the army to watch the military and to preserve the civil rights of my fellow-citizens, should be so reproved by a military man, who was so interested in having acted otherwise. I received it as a severe lecture on my own imprudence."

COLONEL LUCE'S DESERTION, AND RECEPTION IN THE BRITISH CAMP.

"Another providential escape of our army happened at Morristown, in the year 1777. Our army was exceedingly reduced, so that three thousand effective men were the full amount of the whole, and these very poorly formed. To prevent this being known, General Washington distributed them by two and three in a house, all along the main roads round Morristown for miles, so that the general reputation among the country people was that we were forty thousand strong.

"General Howe, desirous of knowing our real strength, sent over a gentleman of some character, a merchant in New York, as a spy into our camp. He told sad stories about the treatment he had received from the British, and that he had deserted from them. The adjutant-general, finding from several circumstances that he was really a spy, applied to General Washington for an order to take him up and confine him. The general examined into the circumstances and, finding the suspicions well supported, forbid the adjutant-general from touching him, but ordered him to go home and immediately to draw returns from every brigadier in the army of the number of their brigades, making the army to consist of about twelve thousand effective men, etc., to place these in the pigeon-holes on his desk, and then to get introduced to the spy, and invite him to lodge with him; to endeavor to get him to sup with him alone; about nine o'clock in the evening to have an orderly sergeant to call on him with positive orders that the adjutant should attend the general in haste; that then he should make an excuse to the gentleman suspected as a spy, and leave him alone about half an hour. This was done, and in this interval—as was suspected—the spy took a copy of the returns and, next morning, went off with them to New York. This convinced General Howe that we were too strong to be attacked, and saved us through the winter.

"A Colonel Luce, who was taken prisoner at Elizabethtown, was confined to a house in Morristown, in a family disaffected to our cause, on his parole. He found out our real situation and obtained full accounts of our weakness, and, indeed, returns of the army, artillery, etc., with our poverty, sickness, etc., according to the truth. With these, expecting to make his fortune, he broke his parole and run off to New York. He was introduced to General Howe, and

with great zeal communicated the whole secret. General Howe called for the returns brought by the spy, and then, in the severest tone, charged Luce with joining the rebels in endeavoring to impose upon him and draw him out into the country, and threatened to hang him up at the first tree. Luce was terrified beyond description as Howe produced copies of the returns from the American brigadiers, obtained in such a manner that there could be no doubt. Luce was glad to escape with his life, mortified and chagrined with having broken his parole; and at last, disappointed, and treated with contempt and great severity, he took to drink, and killed himself by it in the end."

An incident that occurred after the battle of Germantown, while the American army was lying some fourteen miles north of Philadelphia, with the British army at Chestnut Hill, illustrates the military sagacity of Washington, and some of the peculiar difficulties he had to contend against:

"In the autumn of 1777 the American army lay for some time at White Marsh. As commissary-general of prisoners, I managed the intelligence of the army. Reconnoitring along the lines near the city of Philadelphia, I dined at a small post at the Rising Sun, about three miles from the city. After dinner, a little, poor-looking, insignificant old woman came in and solicited leave to go into the country to buy some flour. While we were asking some questions she walked up to me and put into my hands a dirty old needlebook, with various small pockets in it. Surprised at this, I told her to retire, she should have an answer. On opening the needlebook I could not find anything till I got to the last pocket, where I found a piece of paper rolled up into the form of a pipe shank. On unrolling it, I found information that General Howe was coming out the next morning with five thousand men, twelve pieces of cannon, baggage-wagons, and eleven boats on wagon wheels.

"On comparing this with other information, I found it true, and immediately rode post to headquarters. According to my usual custom, and agreeable to orders received from General Washington, I first related to him the naked fact, without comment or opinion. He received it with much thoughtfulness. I then gave him my opinion, that General Howe's design was to cross the Delaware under pretence of going for New York, then in the night to recross the Delaware above Bristol and come suddenly on our rear, where we were totally

unguarded, and cut off all our baggage, if not the whole army. He heard me without a single observation, being deep in thought. I repeated my observation; he still was silent. Supposing myself unattended to, I earnestly repeated my opinion, urging him to order a few redoubts thrown up in our rear, as it was growing late.

"The general answered me: 'Mr. Boudinot, the enemy have no business on our rear, the boats are designed to deceive us. To-morrow morning by daylight you will find them coming down such a by-road on our left.' Then calling an aide-de-camp he ordered a line thrown up along our whole front at the foot of the hill. As I was quartered on that very by-road with six or eight other officers, a mile in front of our army, and no picket in advance of us, this opinion made a deep impression upon me, though I thought the general under a manifest mistake. I returned to my quarters, first obtaining a picket to be put on that road in advance. When I got home, the officers were informed of the news, and my opinion that we should lose our baggage, at least, the next morning; that our general was at last out in his judgment, but repeated his last words; proposed it as a matter of prudence to have our horses saddled, and the servants ordered to have them at the door on the first alarm gun being fired. About three o'clock in the morning we were roused by the alarm guns. We immediately mounted, and by sunrise the British were in possession of our quarters down the by-road mentioned by General Washington. I then said that I never would again set up my judgment against his.

"The enemy remained several days encamped on Chestnut Hill, and General Washington opposite to him. On the evening of the second or third day, General Washington was informed of some very harsh and severe speeches made by a committee from Congress, of whom Robert Morris was one, relative to General Washington, his not attacking the British and putting an end to the war at once, and declaring that if he did not do it further opposition to the British was vain, etc. The fact was that both parties were so strongly covered that the assailant in all probability would have been beaten, and the essential interests of America required that the Americans should avoid a general battle. However, General Washington being exceedingly hurt with these observations and hard speeches, determined at all events to hazard an attack and let the committee abide the consequences. Accordingly he detached General Wayne with his brigade to advance in the evening into the valley between the two armies and near the foot of Chestnut Hill, to be ready in the

morning. Another brigade was advanced part of the way towards him. A spy who was in our camp, immediately on Wayne's movement, carried the intelligence to the British general. A skirmish was had in the day, and one of our militia generals wounded and taken prisoner. He was put into a room adjoining one in which the British aid-de-camp lodged. He overheard an officer come in and tell him that the rebels were advancing to make an attack the next morning, and that their retreat was ordered by the British general. When the American troops began their movement next morning at the dawn of day, not a British soldier was to be seen. The light horse pursued, and came up and harassed the rear of the British a few miles from Philadelphia. Thus the defeat of the American army was again providentially prevented, for we were by no means equal to the attack, as the British were so strongly posted, and our army made up of undisciplined men."

Washington was distinguished for his discernment of men, and very rarely was his judgment of those with whom he came in contact at fault. There was, however, one conspicuous instance of the contrary. To the familiar story of General Charles Lee, the journal adds some interesting details. The chapter is entitled:

EXCHANGE OF GENERAL LEE, WHO OUGHT TO HAVE BEEN HANGED.

"In December, 1776, General Lee being taken prisoner at his quarters at Baskingridge, in the county of Somerset, N. J., about four miles to the left of his troops, by his own negligence and folly, was removed (after the British were beaten at Trenton and Princeton) to New York, and confined in a handsome house under the care of four or five field officers, who lived with him and kept a genteel table. In this situation he sent to Congress, requesting a committee of their body might be sent over to him, as he had something of consequence to communicate to them, and for the purpose sent General Howe's safe conduct for their security. This Congress very justly refused, and treated the application with deserved contempt.

"In January, 1778, I was sent by General Washington over to New York (with consent of General Howe) to examine into the actual situation of our prisoners, and had orders to pay particular attention to General Lee, and accomplish his exchange, if possible.

"The morning after my arrival I waited on General Lee, who

received me with very great pleasure, indeed, and asked me to breakfast with him the next day. This I did, in company with the officers who had the care of him, and was treated with great politeness and affability. When breakfast was over, General Lee asked me up into his room. He soon began to complain very heavily of the treatment he had received from Congress in not complying with his requests. I told him that I thought they had done perfectly right not to trust any of their members within the British lines on such an errand. He replied that he had obtained a safe passport for them from General Howe, and they might have come with the utmost safety. I then asked him what end would have been answered by their coming.

"'Sir,' said he, 'I have discovered the whole plan of the summer's campaign on the part of the British, and would have disclosed the whole to that committee, by which Congress might have obviated all their measures, for, Mr. Boudinot, it is in vain for Congress to expect to withstand the British in the field.'

"I answered that they had been withstood, and that the campaign had passed over and the enemy had gained no great advantage, with all their force and strength. 'But,' I continued, 'General, will you answer me explicitly? Did you inform General Howe that this was your design?' He answered, 'By no means.' 'Then, General,' said I, 'do tell me what reason did you assign to General Howe for so extraordinary a measure as sending for three members of Congress to be permitted to enter a garrisoned town and to confer with their own general, a prisoner of war?' To this he would give me no answer, but immediately began to urge the improbability of our troops, under such an ignorant commander-in-chief, ever withstanding British grenadiers and light infantry; and immediately put his hand into his pocket and pulled out a manuscript of two or three sheets, and said he charged it on me to hearken to what he would read to me, and as soon as I returned to Jersey, that I would repair to Congress and not leave them till I had prevailed upon them to adopt his plan.

"He then read his manuscript, which was a labored argument to prove the impossibility of making headway against the British army, and that, therefore, we should set it down as certain that in the next campaign we must be completely defeated. He, therefore, urged that Congress would immediately have a strong fortress built at Pittsburg, and also several hundred boats; that they would order all the riches of the country sent there, with the old men, women, and children, and that when they found themselves driven there, that Congress and the

others might take boats and go down the Ohio to the Spanish territory for protection.

"The whole of this plan struck me in so absurd a light, added to the impropriety of reading such a thing to me, who, he knew, was on my parole of honor within an enemy's lines, I answered without hesitation that I could not take any such message to Congress from him or any other man without the knowledge of the British general; that I thought he had been very wrong to attempt any such communication to me, knowing my situation; and that I should consider myself as having not heard it; that I wondered at his imprudence in keeping any such writing in his pocket, as the discovery of it in his pocket and in his handwriting might cost him his life. He then waived the business, and I left him.

"In the spring of 1778 a proposition was made by both parties for a partial exchange of prisoners, and I was ordered to Germantown to meet the British commissary to attempt the business. When I was setting off for camp, General Washington called me into his room, and, in the most earnest manner, entreated of me, if I wished to gratify him, that I would obtain the exchange of General Lee, for he was never more wanted by him than at the present moment, and desired that I would not suffer trifles to prevent it. I accordingly went, and made a pretty considerable exchange of prisoners, but quite new propositions were made for the exchange of General Lee, which neither the general nor myself had ever thought of. After reducing the terms to as favorable a scale as I thought right, I agreed to it on condition that if General Washington was not pleased with the new plan, and notice was given of his refusal within twenty-four hours, the exchange was to be void, without any charge of failure on my part.

"I arrived at headquarters about six o'clock P.M., and, going in to the General, began to tell him of my success, when he interrupted me with much eagerness, and asked me if I had exchanged General Lee. I informed him of what had been done. He replied: 'Sit down at this table and write a letter, informing the enemy of my confirmation of the exchange, and send one of my horse-guards immediately to the enemy's lines with it.'

"I assured him that next day would be time enough, but he insisted on it being immediately done, and I sent accordingly, fixing the next day but one for General Lee's coming to us.

"When the day arrived, the greatest preparations were made for his reception. All the principal officers of the army were drawn up in

two lines, in advance of the camp, about two miles towards the enemy. Then the troops, with the inferior officers, formed a line quite to headquarters; all the music of the army attended. The General, with a great number of principal officers and their suites, rode about four miles on the road towards Philadelphia, and waited until General Lee appeared. General Washington dismounted and received General Lee as if he had been his brother. He passed through the lines of officers and the army, who all paid him the highest military honors, to headquarters, where Mrs. Washington was, and here he was entertained with an elegant dinner, and the music playing all the time. A room was assigned him back of Mrs. Washington's sitting-room, and all his baggage was stored in it.

"General Washington gave him command of the right wing of the army, but before he took charge of it he requested leave to go to Congress, at Yorktown, which was readily granted.

"Before he went I had an interview with him. He expressed himself under the greatest obligations to me, and assured me that he should never forget my kindness, but wished exceedingly to know if I had made his communication to Congress, and what was their opinion of it. I assured him that I had not, and that, if he was wise, he would say nothing upon the subject. He said he was going to Congress for hat purpose, and he never would rest till it was done, as now he was more than ever convinced that nothing else could save us; that he found the army in a worse situation than he expected, and that General Washington was not fit to command a sergeant's guard.

"My jealousy of him was greatly confirmed, and I began to interrogate him about his reception in Philadelphia, and immediately brought about the question whether he had seen General Howe. He told me that he had been closeted with him the evening but one before he left the city. I urged him to tell me the substance of the conversation that passed between them. He told me that General Howe began to talk on the claim of independence by the Americans; that he thought it one of the most absurd and hopeless expectations that could enter into the minds of sensible men.

"'And as for you, Lee,' said he, 'what in the devil could get into you to be so crazy? Why, you ought to know better.'

"Lee answered that he thought it a very wise measure, and that if it had not been done, the Americans would have been without excuse. The General (Howe) replied: 'Why, what end can it answer? Do you think there is the most distant probability of their succeeding?'

"To which General Lee replied: 'They were perfectly right. In case of a treaty, what have they to give up for what they may insist on receiving?'

"'Oh, sir,' said the General, 'if that is all they mean by it, it may be proper enough; but I supposed that they aimed at insisting on a separation from the mother country. But in this view, it may be well enough.' And so he (Lee) said they parted. But General Howe sent him a store of wine, spirits, porter, etc. All this increased my suspicions of General Lee exceedingly, and I watched him with a jealous eye.

"He went to Congress, and, as I was afterwards informed, he applied to Congress for a committee to meet and confer with him. The President, Mr. Laurens, was directed to this service, to whom General Lee communicated his plan, which disgusted Mr. Laurens so greatly that he would not even report it to Congress. This lessened the General so greatly in the eyes of Congress that they never paid much respect to him afterwards.

"He returned to the army, and took command of the right wing. He immediately began a cabal against General Washington and to quarrel with the Marquis Lafayette. He assured me himself that General Washington was ruining the whole cause; that he was looking forward to the British evacuating Philadelphia and going to New York, and, of course, strengthening his left, while the right was totally unguarded; but Lee said that the enemy would pass over to Chester and come suddenly on their right wing, and we should be wholly overthrown. He said he had urged this in council, but that he had been overruled, and therefore was no longer accountable.

"When the British army actually passed through Jersey, and General Washington, by his great precaution, had advanced two brigades toward the Delaware, and therefore overtook the British at Freehold, General Lee was greatly mortified, and at first refused to take command of the advanced party, and it was given to the Marquis Lafayette; but on finding that the advanced army was reënforced and raised to a very respectable command, he insisted on the command, and to keep peace it was given to him. General Lee accordingly came up with General Clinton near Freehold Court House, and a skirmish took place. General Lee had a considerable military knowledge, and did very well on a small scale; but I have no doubt that whenever anything on a very large scale struck him, a partial lunacy took place.

"His behavior this morning discovered this state of mind, which might have been increased from the peculiarity of his situation and his exalted ideas of the prowess of British troops. In the midst of the engagement he rode up to a lieutenant-colonel of my acquaintance who had a single field-piece firing, and called to him:

"'Colonel, have you seen anything improper in my conduct this morning?' The colonel, who had been conscious of something wrong in the General all the morning, yet not choosing to acknowledge it, answered: 'No; by no means.'

"'Well, then,' said the General, 'do you remember that.' Such an extraordinary question from a commander of a division, under such extraordinary circumstances, is full proof that he must have felt something unusual in himself."

Among the constantly recurring occasions of embarrassment during the war were those connected with the exchange and treatment of prisoners. Naturally, the journal of the commissary of prisoners makes frequent reference to these difficulties:

MY ACCOUNTS WITH CONGRESS.

"When I found every application to obtain hard money from Congress for the clothing of our prisoners in vain, I waited on General Washington and proposed my resignation, as my character was at stake, having (on the promise of the secret committee to yield me every necessary aid) pledged myself to the officers in confinement that they should be regularly supplied with every necessary, but they now suffered more than ever. In much distress, he assured me that if he was deserted by the gentlemen of the country he should despair. He could not do everything. He was general, quartermaster, and commissary. Everything fell on him, and he was unequal to the task. He gave me the most positive engagements that if I would contrive any mode for their support and comfort, he would confirm it as far as was in his power. On this I told him that I knew of but one way, and that was to borrow money on my own private security. He assured me, that in case I did, and was not reimbursed by Congress, he would go an equal share with me in the loss. I then formed the plan of obliging General Burgoyne to pay hard money for the support of the British prisoners whom we supplied with daily rations, and in the meantime proceeded to borrow money or take goods in New York on

my own credit. Thus I furnished three hundred officers with a handsome suit of clothes each, and eleven hundred men with a plain suit, found them blankets, shirts, etc., and added to their provisions furnished by the British a full half ration of bread and beef a day for upwards of fifteen months. Part of this I supplied by sending wheat and flour to New York, and selling them for hard money, under leave from General Robertson. Some time in the beginning of the year 1778 Congress received from General Burgoyne near $40,000 in hard money.

"In the beginning of 1778 I was chosen a member of Congress, but continued in the army till June, when General Washington, knowing that I was near $30,000 in advance for the prisoners, urged me to go and take my seat in Congress, where I might get some of the hard money received from General Burgoyne before it was all expended; for if it was once gone, I should be totally ruined. I accordingly left the army and joined Congress on their return from York, in Pennsylvania, after the British had evacuated the city of Philadelphia. I applied to the Chamber of Accounts, and with great difficulty got my account settled. A very large balance was found in my favor, and a warrant ordered for $15,000, Continental, and a report made that I had actually advanced the cash, and there was upwards of £10,000 besides, hard money that I yet owed. I urged the appointment of a committee of Congress to an examination of these expenditures and to report upon them. Richard Henry Lee and William Duer were accordingly appointed, and after a full examination reported the sum of Twenty-Six Thousand Six Hundred and Sixty-Six Dollars and ⅔ in specie, for which they recommended a warrant to be immediately issued. On considering this report, Mr. Dana from Massachusetts, and Mr. Merchant from Rhode Island, opposed the report of the committee with great violence, insisting that as Mr. Boudinot had taken up this money at the instance of General Washington, without the approbation of Congress, he had no right to be paid but in Continental money, as other creditors of Congress. After much altercation I got up, and informed the House that I had borrowed this money on my private credit, in the city of New York; that I should never ask the House for the payment of it again; and that I should, on my return home, sell what property I had, and pay as far as that would go, and then publish to the world why I was insolvent for the balance. But I also informed the House that, even to that moment, our prisoners in New York were fed and clothed on my private credit; that I would immediately send

orders to stop further issues to them on my account in ten days, and desired provision might be made for these unhappy people after the expiration of that time. On which they went to other business, without doing anything on the report.

"I sent orders to my agent in New York, and all further issues were stopped accordingly.

"The latter end of July I received a very affecting letter from my agent, painting the distresses of the prisoners in so striking a manner, and the death of several more than had been usual, that I could not longer persist in my determination of silence on the subject. Having received this letter in Congress, I rose with much emotion, and, reminding them of my former promise, begged leave to break through it, so far as to read the letter, which I did. On this, Mr. Duer, a man of much feeling, rose, and in a speech of more than half an hour declaimed so severely against the ungrateful conduct of the House, that a unanimous vote immediately passed for a warrant in my favor, £10,000 in specie, which was immediately sent to New York."

The complaints of cruel treatment of American prisoners within the enemy's lines became such that, armed with a passport from General Howe, Colonel Boudinot was sent by Washington to New York in February, 1778, to make investigation into the facts. From the full record of this visit, let me give you Colonel Boudinot's account of an interview with General Robertson, commandant of the city, whom he had formerly known, and by whom he was now courteously treated.

CONVERSATION WITH GENERAL ROBERTSON, BRITISH COMMANDER AT NEW YORK.

"One day, while calling on General Robertson, he asked me if I had any objection to a free, private political conversation. I answered that I could not have any. He asked me into his bedroom, and began by inquiring why so much blood was shed among those who were brethren, when it was apparent that no valuable end could be answered by it; why no one had yet stepped forth to stop so unnatural carnage and prevent the cutting of each other's throats. I replied that no good reason, in my opinion, could be assigned; that the fault lay with them, they had invaded our land, we had not troubled them. All

we asked was to be heard; this was refused, and a war of desolation was brought by them into our country. It was, therefore, with them to make propositions, that we might know what it was they would be at; that we were not only ignorant of the art of war and almost wholly unprepared for it, but were lovers of peace, and only wished to enjoy our habitations in quietness. He expressed himself very strongly against the war, as being an unnatural destruction of each other by which nothing valuable was to be gained; that he had authority to assure me that if any one was to step forward and heal the unhappy differences he should be rewarded in any manner he might ask, even to a pension of £10,000 sterling. I replied that there could be no necessity for this; that the Americans were desirous of peace, and would eagerly seize every opportunity of embracing it, but the proposition, from the nature of the thing, must come from them. He observed that Lord Howe and General Howe had been authorized to make peace with us on almost any terms. I assured him that I had been conversant with the proceedings of Congress and the knowledge of General Washington, and I did not believe that any such thing was known. After a little reflection he insisted that the thing was so, and that Lord Howe had actually written an account of it to General Washington before his landing, while off the Hook. On my repeating my disbelief, he said that this was one of the evils of the present dispute; that a parcel of demagogues had possessed themselves of the government, and had kept the people in entire ignorance of the true principles of the difference. He was sure that if the people of America were left to themselves they had too much good sense to continue the breach, after such offers of peace on our own terms. At last, starting as from a revery, he said, you must know it, as he had seen Lord Howe's letter in our newspapers. I asked him if he did not know that Lord Howe's authority went no further than merely to grant pardons, etc. He seemed confused, and said that any agreement Howe made would be ratified by the British Parliament. I reminded him that the war had been brought on by the British minister's having refused to let Parliament only hear us, that being the sum of our last petition; and whether, as he said he knew many sensible and worthy men in America, he thought those sensible men would ever submit to make a treaty with any British commissioners (and thereby lose the friendship of France), and trust to a British ministry, whose treatment had hitherto been so unworthy of men of probity or political understanding, to have it ratified by Parliament. He now

seemed a little chagrined, and said with some petulance, that he did not know what American gentlemen had done with their oaths of allegiance: 'Indeed, sir, I know not how you have got over your oath of allegiance, for I know you have taken one.' I answered that it had been a matter of some difficulty with me till I was legally discharged by an Act of the British Parliament. He said he had never heard of any such Act. I told him (much in the language he had used to me in the beginning) that I had long known the misfortune of the British officers, that they were kept in total ignorance of the causes and reasons of the war in which they were engaged; that they were obliged to obey, and fight in every cause, whether right or wrong; that I supposed that this Act was kept from their knowledge, but I knew the fact, and had seen it as published in *St. James's Chronicle.* He assured me that this must be a congressional falsehood, for no such Act had ever been passed. I asked him if he was acquainted with the British Constitution, and what he thought of allegiance and protection. He said they always went together, and that without protection no allegiance was due. I replied, 'Have you never seen, sir, an Act of Parliament putting all the colonies, friends and foes, out of the king's protection?' The old gentleman seemed alarmed at his confession, and with warmth said, 'A damned Act, a damned Act; I told the ministry so at the time; a damned Act; let us go down stairs;' and so our conversation ended."

It was but three or four months after, that the following significant interview occurred:

"In the spring of 1778, about the month of May or beginning of June, I was appointed by General Washington to meet a commissioner on the part of the British at Germantown, to exchange the Hessian prisoners in our custody. On my arrival I found the British commissioner was the same General Robertson, who had brought out a gentleman with him who had been an acquaintance of mine, a very sensible, prudent, genteel man. After doing our business and dining together, this gentleman asked me if I would walk in the garden with him. I readily agreed; when there he asked me if I had any objection to a confidential political conversation. I said I could have none. He told me that the British exceedingly regretted our unhappy dispute. That they were convinced it could end in no substantial good to either party; that if any person would undertake to settle the

unhappy dispute he was authorized to promise him anything he would ask, from a dukedom to ten thousand sterling pension. To this I replied as before, to General Robertson, that offers of that kind could have no effect on men who were acting from principle; that America wanted peace and quietness; that the British had invaded us, and it was on her part to say what she wanted. He said he came authorized in the fullest manner to offer a carte blanche; it should be signed by proper authority, and I might fill it up myself. I told him that I was too well acquainted with the British government and the nature of the dispute not to know that such an offer was merely delusive, and that it could only tend to deceive, for they never designed nor could do any such thing. He in the most positive terms assured me that it was all real, and nothing could give more pleasure to the government than to have it agreed to. I answered that I did not doubt his honesty in the business, but well knew that he was imposed upon. He, however, insisted so strenuously on the rectitude of their intentions that he would venture his life upon their agreeing to any terms that I would dictate. In reply, I said I would try him, and thereby bring the matter to the test. That I would fill up his carte blanche with only one term—that we should be allowed one single free bottom to every part of the world. His countenance fell, and with much apparent distress he said, 'Sir, you are right; it is impossible.' 'Well, sir,' said I, 'it is not all the power of Great Britain and all that she is worth will ever bring America to submit without having a free trade to every part of the world, with as many ships as she can command, and therefore the project is vain.' He acknowledged his error, begged my pardon for the trouble he had given me, and the freedom he had used, and we returned into the house."

Here is a suggestive incident which gives us a glimpse of the difficulties which Washington had sometimes to meet through the ill-advised interference of Congress in the conduct of the war. I quote only a part of the story:

CARTEL FOR EXCHANGE OF PRISONERS.

"In the winter of 1778, while lying at the Valley Forge, both armies called loudly for the exchange of prisoners. Propositions were accordingly made by the British to which Congress agreed, by giving full powers to appoint commissioners, to meet a like number on the

part of the British for the purpose. The general accordingly appointed Colonel Hamilton, Colonel Harrison, Colonel Grayson, and myself. General Howe appointed Colonel O'Harah, Colonel Stevens, and Captain Fitzpatrick, and we were to meet at Germantown. Previous to the meeting, as it was a matter quite new to us, we proposed a meeting of general officers with General Washington, that we might discuss the business before them and know their opinions. About this time Congress sent a committee of their body into the army, to reform it. General Washington called this committee to the meeting. He sat as chairman. We discussed the matter over. The committee of Congress soon discovered their sentiments against an exchange, and urged it as the opinion of Congress that the settling this cartel should be merely ostensible, for the purpose of satisfying the army and throwing the blame on the British, but true policy required us to avoid an exchange of prisoners just at the opening of the campaign. We absolutely refused to undertake the business on these principles; if we went, we were determined to make the best cartel we could for the liberation of our prisoners. We would not be made instruments in so dishonorable a measure. General Washington also resented it, and said his troops looked up to him as their protector, and that he would not suffer an opportunity to be lost of liberating every soldier who was then in captivity, let the consequence be what it might. The committee were much disgusted, and soon left the army (where they gave much dissatisfaction) and retired to Congress. Before the meeting of the commissioners, General Washington received a resolution of Congress, couched in the most insulting terms, setting forth that he had appointed commissioners to settle the cartel whom he knew held principles adverse to the true interests of America, etc. On this I applied to the general and desired to be excused from the service. He refused, ordered us to the duty, and told us to make the best treaty in our power, and he would ratify it, and take the risque upon himself. In the month of June after this I went as a delegate to Congress, and the first thing I did was to search the secret minutes for this resolution of Congress, determined to have them expunged from the minutes. Not being able to find it, I applied to President Laurens, to know where I might find it. He laughed, and said that Congress was so ashamed of the measure that was run upon them by the committee from the army that, in two or three days after, they had expunged the whole from their minutes."

The history of the taking of Yorktown, and of the movements that led to it, is sufficiently familiar. As recorded in the journal, the story receives additional interest from personal incidents. I give one or two extracts:

SIEGE OF YORKTOWN.

"The siege of Yorktown was merely accidental. General Washington, the fall and winter before, had planned with a committee of Congress the storming of the works at New York and the repossession of that city. He communicated his designs to the French general, and the arrival of Count de Grasse with a French fleet was part of the plan. Requisitions on the different states for a supply of the necessary men were duly made by Congress, to be in the field by a given day. A number of very large battering cannon were provided and other preparations were made. A little before the expected reënforcement Lafayette was very hard pressed by the British in Virginia. He had not men enough to make headway against them, and had to depend on manœuvring. He wrote to Washington for aid. Washington replied by letting him into his designs on New York—that he must do as well as he could with the force he had, as he could not spare him a man; and that when the enemy should discover his intention it would work a diversion in Lafayette's favor. This letter was sent by mail, which was captured in passing through Jersey, and the letter fell into the enemy's hands. Thus his whole design was betrayed, with the weakness of Lafayette. However, preparations went on; but the day for the assembling of the troops arrived, and the supplies did not more than fill up the places of the sick and dead through the winter. Washington remonstrated to Congress and the states in vain, his numbers were not half sufficient to justify an attack on New York. He feared he should become the derision of the French army and the enemy. His mind, ever full of resources, immediately suggested the plan of taking advantage of the enemy's knowledge of his plans. He wrote to Congress; had a confidential and secret committee appointed, of which I was one. He immediately assembled the army, weak as it was, in the counties of Essex and Morris, near New York; had the large new battering cannon sent on at great expense from Philadelphia; erected very large ovens at Chatham, at eleven miles above Elizabethtown. They went out on tiptoe, with the expectation of soon entering New York. On the morning of his intended departure,

about daylight, he sent for an old inhabitant of New York who lived in the neighborhood, who was suspected of giving intelligence to the enemy, and put a number of important questions to him about the situation of the country around Middletown and Sandy Hook, where the man was born and bred; also about the state of the land on the opposite Long Island shore, with respect to the landing of troops, water, etc., urging that he was fond of knowing the situation in the different parts of the country, as in the course of the war he might be unexpectedly called into them. He urged upon him the most profound secrecy, and by no means to lisp a word of what had passed between them. In one hour the army marched, apparently for Princeton, which might be a good road to Monmouth if a deception was intended. I happened to be in the neighborhood of the army, and about ten o'clock called on the man on whom the general had enjoined so much secrecy, and he convinced me that the siege of New York was determined, and that by the way of Monmouth and Long Island. He told me everything that had passed between him and the general, and I doubt not that the British general heard it also the same night. The British never suspected any other design until they were informed that the American army had passed the Delaware before it was too late. When they arrived at Philadelphia the army showed great discontent at not receiving certain arrears of pay which had long been withheld. It was thought not prudent to proceed further until after a partial payment was made. Money was also wanted to hire vessels and other means to proceed down the Chesapeake Bay. The treasury was empty, Congress had no means of raising money, and requisitions had been resorted to in vain. In this exigency the vigorous energy of Robert Morris, superintendent of finances, relieved their distress. He went out among his mercantile and other friends and borrowed on his own responsibility upwards of $30,000, which answered every purpose, and the army soon appeared before Yorktown."

THE CAPTURE OF YORKTOWN.

"At the siege of Yorktown the French troops, brought out by Count de Grasse, were absolutely necessary to complete the line of circumvallation and perfect the siege. About two days before the capture the Count sent word to Washington that he should within forty-eight hours withdraw those troops, and that Washington must provide accordingly. This was in effect raising the siege. General

Washington remonstrated against it in vain. He sent Lafayette on board of the fleet to dissuade Count de Grasse against so ruinous a measure. The latter persisted, and said his orders were not discretionary. Washington, finding that nothing but storming the enemy's lines would prevent raising the siege, and that this would necessarily occasion great loss on both sides, which he wanted to avoid, adopted the following expedient: he sent out Colonel Hamilton with some other officers under a flag of truce on some business. They were met half-way by a number of British officers. They carried with them something to eat and drink. In conversation they expressed to the British officers their concern for them as gentlemen and soldiers—that the American army had determined to storm their lines—that the American soldiery and country people were so exasperated by the conduct of the British to the southward that they could not answer for the consequences, as they did not think they could be restrained by authority and discipline—that they knew General Washington's humane temper, and his wish to avoid unnatural shedding of blood—that in case of a capitulation they believed the same terms would be given that the British gave to our troops at Charlestown, with the addition of the officers wearing side arms and being immediately sent on their parole to New York—that they did not wish their names mentioned, etc. Within a few hours after their return proposals for surrender were sent out, and the capitulation took place, Count de Grasse remaining several days (notwithstanding the positive nature of his orders) to enjoy the pleasure of the surrender, rejoicings, etc. General Washington then earnestly requested his landing a body of troops near Eden Town in North Carolina, that the British in that neighborhood might be surprised, but he obstinately refused, although he spent nearly twice the time necessary for the purpose before he left the coast, doing nothing."

Colonel Boudinot mentions this pathetic incident in connection with this event, that when the messenger brought the news of the capitulation to Congress, it was necessary to furnish him with hard money for his expenses. There was not sufficient in the treasury to do it, and the members of Congress, of whom Boudinot was one, each paid a dollar to accomplish it.

A well-known incident of the war is invested with new interest as told in the journal:

PARDON OF CAPTAIN ASGIL.

"In the year 1782 Governor Franklin, as the head of the Refugees, sent out a party of Refugees into the county of Monmouth, New Jersey, and took a Captain Huddy prisoner. By their particular orders he was hanged in a very insulting and cruel manner, under pretence of retaliation for a person who was shot in the act of running away from his guard. This made a great row in our camp and throughout the states. General Washington saw the necessity of not suffering so great an act of barbarity, contrary to all the rules of civilized warfare, to pass unnoticed. He therefore sent immediate orders to Lancaster, Pennsylvania, where a number of British officers (prisoners) were kept, to draw lots for one, who should be made an example of, by being hanged in retaliation for Huddy, unless he obtained full satisfaction, by the enemy sending out the author of the inhuman act. Notice of this was given to Congress, who readily approved the measure. Notice was also given to the British commander in New York. The lot was drawn, and it fell on Captain Asgil, son of Sir Charles Asgil. He was accordingly sent to General Washington at Morris Town. A number of officers of his corps attended him, who were allowed to remonstrate to their general. The British immediately ordered the officer commanding the party to be arrested and tried by a court-martial, and notice of this was finally given to General Washington, with a request that Asgil's execution might be delayed till the determination of the court-martial was known. The sitting of the court was drawn out to a great length, when finally the prisoner was found not guilty of murder with malice prepense, and a copy of the proceedings was sent to General Washington, and by him to Congress. It clearly appeared from the testimony that the prisoner acted under orders from the Board of Refugees, of which Governor Franklin was president, and that though the prisoner might be entitled to the acquittal, that yet Governor Franklin was the culprit, and should have been punished.

"Congress took the matter under full consideration, during which General Sir Guy Carleton arrived at New York with the title of commander-in-chief, and the preliminary articles of peace were announced. General Washington then wrote to Congress that he had first proposed the retaliation on Captain Asgil as an act of mercy on the whole, to put a stop to the enemy destroying the lives of our

citizens in future, as they had done in times past; that he had determined to carry it into execution, not being satisfied with the result of the court-martial; but that unexpectedly the preliminary articles of peace had wholly changed the ground. The execution of an innocent person ought to have an object in view to prevent the unnecessary shedding of blood; that the example now could not have any effect, as there would be nothing for it to operate upon, etc.; that, therefore, he should stay the execution of Captain Asgil, without an express order from Congress to the contrary.

"A very large majority of Congress were determined on his execution; and a motion was made for a resolution, positively ordering his immediate execution. Mr. Duane and myself, considering the reasons assigned by the commander-in-chief conclusive, made all the opposition in our power. We urged every argument that the peculiarity of the case suggested, and spent three days in warm debate, during which more ill blood appeared in the House than I had seen. Near the close of the third day, when every argument was exhausted, without any appearance of success, the matter was brought to a close by the question being ordered to be taken. I again rose and told the House that in so important a case, where the life of an innocent person was concerned, we had (though in a small minority) exerted ourselves to the utmost of our power. We had acquitted our consciences, and washed our hands clean from the blood of that young man. That we saw his fate was sealed. That now we had nothing to do but to request that the proceedings should appear without doors, as being equal to the occasion, and the world should know that we had conducted the measure with a serious solemnity, that great warmth had been occasioned, some harsh language had taken place, the minds of gentlemen had been irritated. I therefore moved that the question should be put off till the next morning, on the minority giving their words that they would not say another word on the subject, but the question should be taken in the first place, after the meeting, as of course. This was unanimously agreed to.

"The next morning, as soon as the minutes were read, the president announced a letter from the commander-in-chief. On its being read he stated the receipt of a letter from the King and Queen of France, enclosing one from Mrs. Asgil, the mother of Captain Asgil, to the queen, that on the whole was enough to move the heart of a savage. The substance was asking the life of young Asgil. This operated like an electrical shock, each member looking on his neighbor

in surprise, as if saying, 'Here is unfair play.' It was suspected to be some scheme of the minority. The president was interrogated, the cover of the letters was called for, the general's signature was examined; in short, it looked so much like something supernatural that even the minority, who were so much pleased with it, could scarcely think it real. After being fully convinced of the integrity of the transaction, a motion was made that the life of Captain Asgil should be given as a compliment to the King of France. This was unanimously carried, on which it was moved that the commander-in-chief should remand Captain Asgil to his quarters at Lancaster. To this I objected, that as we considered Captain Asgil's life as forfeited, and we had given him to the King of France, he was now a free man, and therefore I moved that he should be immediately returned into New York, without exchange. This also was unanimously adopted, and thus we got clear of shedding innocent blood, by a wonderful interposition of heaven. Captain Asgil soon sailed for England, and on his arrival he behaved without any sense of obligation for his escape, by suffering the most false and injurious accounts of his liberation to be published in all the newspapers, without an attempt to contradict them."

I will not venture to give further extracts from this interesting journal, but I cannot forbear quoting a sentence from a letter of Colonel Boudinot, under date of August 20, 1783, and so just after the close of the war:

"I have been in the midst of the principal scenes of action during the whole contest. I have not been a bare spectator. I have carefully watched and compared the steps of Divine Providence thro' the whole, and as the result I can assure you that our success has not been the effect of either our numbers, power, wisdom, or art. It has been manifestly the effect (I was going to say the miraculous effect) of the astonishing interposition of a holy God in our favor. I do not mean in the least to derogate from the bravery, wisdom, patience, and perseverance of our army. . . . My meaning is that in no instance have our numbers, power, wisdom, or art been such that, in the judgment of impartial judges, success could have been reasonably depended on, independent of the overruling power of heaven. In many instances our misfortunes have been our happi-

ness, and often our blunders and mistakes have been the cause of our succeeding beyond the most sanguine expectations."

Does not the spirit of the old Huguenots breathe in these pages? Like the Puritans of Old and New England, the Huguenots of France and their early descendants in this country were distinguished by their steadfast following of the highest known law of duty, and by their unfaltering trust in the overruling providence of God; while they added to the sterner excellencies of the English patriots a certain gracious quality which is better felt than defined.

GENEALOGICAL NOTES.

BOUDINOT FAMILY.

The old Protestant registers of baptisms, marriages, and interments at Marans are preserved in the archives of the Consistory of La Rochelle. I am indebted to the kind courtesy of M. Meschinet de Richmond, of La Rochelle, an honorary member of the Huguenot Society of America, for a copy of all the entries in these registers bearing the name Boudinot. A manuscript History of the Reformed Church at Marans, by M. Ernest Chatonet, is in the library of the Protestant Historical Society in Paris, which I have been permitted to inspect, and have had copied such references to the Boudinots as are there given. These are chiefly accounts of prosecutions, etc., for a brief period immediately preceding the Revocation.

JEAN BOUDINOT, m. Marie Suire: his name appears in the registers Oct. 17, 1669; an entry, Sept. 15, 1680, speaks of him and his wife as deceased. Their children were: *Jean*, m. Marie Brechet; *Pierre*, m. Jeanne Guis; ELIE, m. Jeanne Baraud; *Judith*, m. Pierre Vigoureux; *Esther*; *Marie*. To the name of each brother and of the brother-in-law Vigoureux, *le sieur* is prefixed.

ELIE BOUDINOT (1st), son of the preceding, born at Marans, d. New York, 1702 (Baird, "Huguenot Emigration," I., 298, has evidently been misled in giving to him, as he does, the title of Seigneur de Cressy; there is no trace of any such designation), m. Jeanne Baraud. Their children, born in France, were: *Pierre*, b. 27 Feb., 1674; ELIE, b. Nov. 11, 1674; *Abraham*, b. Oct. 30, 1676, died Nov. 6, 1677; *Jean*, b. Sep. 6, 1682; *Mary*. His wife died before he left France. In London, m. Nov. 9, 1686, Suzanne Papin, widow of Benjamin d'Harriette. The children by the second marriage were, *Madelaine*, m. Thomas Bayeux, and left issue, Madelaine, b. May 21, 1706; Thomas, b. July 5, 1708; *Suzanne*, b. July 12, 1689, m. Feb. 2, 1706, Charles D'Val, afterward m. David Minvielle, and left issue, child b. May 22, 1713; *Jean*, b. Nov. 10, 1692, m. Jeanne Tongrelou, and had issue, Jean, b. Oct. 4, 1710; *Benjamin*, b. May 19, 1694. The children by the first wife all died before their father, except Elie, as he is mentioned in his father's

will as the only son living of the first marriage. Pierre's name occurs in the church register, 1692, 1697.

Elie Boudinot (2d), son of the preceding, b. at Marans, Nov. 11, 1674, d. 1719, came with his father to New York, 1687, m. Sep. 10, 1699, Marie Catharine Carrée, daughter of Louis Carrée. Their children were, *Marie*, b. Jan. 12, 1701, m. John Emott, and left three daughters, viz., Elizabeth, m. Col. Wm. Ricketts, and left issue John, Jacob, and Jane Ricketts; Mary, m. John Chetwood, Esq., afterward a Justice of the Supreme Court of N. J., and left several children; Jane, m. Rev. Thomas Bradbury Chandler, Episcopal minister at Elizabeth, N. J., and left one daughter, who m. Bishop Hobart, and another daughter who m. Major William Dayton, and lived to be "one of the most venerable and interesting Christian ladies of Elizabethtown, N. J.;" *Suzanne*, b. Aug. 19, 1703, m. Pierre Vergereau, of New York, and left issue, Pierre, m. Abigail Hetfield; Suzanne, b. Dec. 21, 1743, m. Rev. William Tennent, Presbyterian minister of Charleston, S. C., and left several children; Elias (3d), b. Aug. 8, 1706; *Madelaine*, b. May 2, 1709; *Jean*, b. 1710; *David*, b. March 5, 1714.

Elias Boudinot (3d), son of the preceding, b. 1706, d. July 4, 1770, m. in Antigua Catharine Williams (b. 1714, d. 1765), daughter of a Welsh planter. Their children who survived infancy were: *John*, b. in Antigua, Jan. 10, 1734, baptized by Mr. Francis Byam, minister of St. John's parish, studied medicine, m. Catharine Van Norden, left issue Elias, Tobias, John, Jane; *Annis*, b. July 1, 1736, m. Richard Stockton, signer of the Declaration of Independence, and their daughter Julia, m. 1776, Dr. Benjamin Rush, whose son, Richard Rush, b. 1780, was Attorney-General of the United States, Minister to England, Secretary of the Treasury, and Minister to France; Elias (4th), b. Ap. 21, 1740, d. Oct. 1821, baptized by the Rev. George Whitefield, m. Ap. 21, 1762, Hannah Stockton (b. July 21, 1736, d. Oct. 28, 1808), sister of Richard Stockton; besides two children who d. in infancy, left one child, Susan Vergereau (b. Dec. 21, 1764, d. Nov. 30, 1854), m. Oct. 1784, William Bradford, Attorney-General of the United States under Washington; *Mary*, b. Nov. 7, 1742, m. Abner Hetfield, brother of above-mentioned Abigail Hetfield, and left issue Mary, m. Rev. Jos. G. Bend, Episcopal minister of Baltimore, and Abigail, m. William Griffith, Esq.; Elisha, b. Jan. 2, 1749 (see below); *Lewis Carrée*, b. Sep. 1753, lost at sea, 1786.

Elisha Boudinot, son of Elias Boudinot (3d), b. Philadelphia, Jan. 2, 1749, d. Oct. 17, 1819, m. Oct. 14, 1778, Catharine Smith (b. Dec. 16, 1749, d. Aug. 30, 1797), daughter of William Peartree Smith, of Elizabethtown. Their children were: *Anna Maria*, b. Nov. 26, 1780, d. Aug. 29, 1811; *Catharine*, b. Dec. 2, 1781, d. June 24, 1877, m. Sep. 12, 1803, Lewis Atterbury, then of Baltimore (b. Ap. 2, 1779, d. Aug. 31, 1872); *Eliza*, b. Ap. 2, 1783, d. Aug. 7, 1783; *Susan*, b. July 31, 1784, m. in advanced life Mr. Salmon; *Julia*, b. Sep. 6, 1785, d. 1812; *Eliza Emelia Stockton*, b. Mch. 178–, d. young; *William*, b. Feb. 11, 1788, d. Jan. 17, 1789; *Anna Emelia*, b. Feb. 11, 1789, d. Aug. 9, 1793; *Elias E.*, b. Mch. 11, 1791, d. May 21, 1863, m. Jane M. Kip; *Eliza Pintard*, b. Feb. 21, 1792, m. John Colt, of Paterson, N. J.; *William Alexander Hamilton*, b. Feb. 20, 1795, d. Sep., 1795.

Elisha Boudinot studied law with his brother Elias (4th), early became active in the patriot movements; in 1775 was member and clerk of Newark Committee of Safety; April 12, 1777, appointed Secretary of the Council of Safety of the State; elected December 12, 1778, by the Council and General Assembly, Commissary of Prisoners for the State of New Jersey; after the war he established himself at Newark, where he rose to eminence as a lawyer, and became, March 9, 1798, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State. After the death of his first wife m. Rachel Bradford, sister of William Bradford, Attorney-General of the United States under Washington, and after her death m. Catherine Beekman, daughter of James Beekman, Esq., of New York, both of whom died without issue.

THE FAMILY OF PRIULI,*

ALSO CALLED PRIOLI, PRIOLO, PRIOLEAU.

By Edward M. Gallaudet, LL.D.

The student of American history and biography can find no worthier subjects for his research and admiration than the records of the brave men and women of the seventeenth century, who, for conscience' sake, left homes of comfort and often of luxury in the Old World, to find dwelling-places for themselves and their children in the trans-Atlantic wilderness.

Among these heroes and heroines, descent from whom is better than a patent of nobility, no name shines with clearer lustre, in the light of his manly virtues and spirit of self-sacrifice, than that of the Rev. Elias Prioleau, founder and first pastor of the Huguenot Church of Charleston, South Carolina.

The writer's attention was accidentally directed to this true nobleman of "times that tried men's souls," by his finding the unusual name of Prioleau in records of his own ancestry. And references to a few old biographical dictionaries having revealed the fact that people of this name had been eminent in more than one country in Europe, the writer was led to continue his studies, that he might prepare as complete a sketch as possible of the family from which the pious pioneer of Carolina was descended.

Among the faithful followers of Elias Prioleau to America was his brother Elisha, in whose family Bible, still existing, may be found a record, under date of September 3, 1734, which declares that his father was the Rev. Samuel Prioleau of Pons, in the district of Saintonge, France; and that *his* father was Antonio Priuli, Doge of Venice 1618–23.

The fact that Samuel† was only four or five years old when

---

* Paper read before the Huguenot Society April, 13, 1894.

† Rev. George Howe, in his "History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina," says: "Some American authorities make him the son of Antonio Priuli, who was elected Doge of Venice in 1618."

his father the Doge died is alluded to, and the statement is made that those who had charge of his education, being inclined to the Reformed religion, had him trained for the ministry.

Such a record as this, made in his own family Bible, by a man of high standing and more than ordinary intelligence, as Elisha Prioleau is known to have been, would usually be accepted as having a definite historic value, if not as absolutely authentic. But Elisha had no right to claim the ninety-fourth Doge of Venice as his grandfather; at the same time it is true, in spite of the denials of several learned writers who will presently be quoted, that he was descended from that noble family to which the Doge belonged. And the way in which he and his father fell into their genealogical blunder will be made plain.

Leaving now for a while the Prioleaus of America, we will see who their ancestors were in the countries across the sea, where for nearly eight hundred years they have exerted no inconsiderable influence.

Of the history of the Priulis in Hungary, where they flourished prior to the year 1000, the writer has, as yet, been able to find no record.

In 1097 members of the family settled in Venice, where they soon took rank with the most * distinguished and powerful of the nobility.

In 1319† they were among those whose right to sit in the council was recognized as perpetual and hereditary, and the only families of higher rank were those very few who traced their lineage to some one of the twelve tribunes who elected the first Doge in 697.

Early in the fifteenth century Maria, daughter of Andrew Priuli, a merchant prince, became the wife of Francesco Foscari,‡ who enjoyed the distinction of reigning as Doge for the unparalleled period of thirty-four years. In 1453 the hand of Maria Priuli's daughter was sought in marriage by the Em-

---

* Zedler's Universal Lexicon, Leipsic, 1741. *Vid.* Prioli.

† Daru, Histoire de la Venise.

‡ Hazlitt's History of Venice.

peror Constantine* of Constantinople, but the negotiation did not terminate successfully.

The brilliant reign of Maria's husband was darkly shadowed in its later years by the crimes of their petted son, Jacob Foscari, who abused the confidence placed in him by embezzling on a gigantic scale, and at last, after having been pardoned for these offences through the influence of his father, was unjustly accused of murdering Ermolao Donato, a distinguished citizen, and died in exile for crimes he had not committed. His misdeeds led to his father's deposition from his office as Doge, and to his death of a broken heart, which soon followed. The story of the Foscari family is made the basis of the well-known drama by Lord Byron. Not long after the death of the Foscaris another tragedy saddened the Priuli family.

Francis Priuli,† a young man of remarkable scholarship, learned in astrological lore, published among other books a life and horoscope of Pope Leo X., the brilliant Giovanni di Medici, second son of Lorenzo the Magnificent.

This book secured for its author the ill-will and condemnation of His Holiness, which plunged the young man into such deep despondency that he determined to live no longer.

He first tried to drown himself, but was rescued. Then he threw himself into the fire, but failed to accomplish his object. Casting himself headlong from a window into the street, he escaped death by a miracle. Despairing of other means of ending his life, he resorted successfully to starvation.

The first of the Priulis to become Doge of Venice was Lorenzo, who was elected in 1556.

In 1557 this Doge married Julia Dandoli, a descendant of the famous Doge Enrico Dandoli, who, five hundred years earlier, at the age of ninety and almost blind, led in person a victorious assault on the fortifications of Constantinople, and the chronicle relates that the wedding festivities surpassed in magnificence anything of the kind seen in Venice for a hundred years.

---

* This was the Constantine whose downfall is vividly described in Wallace's "Prince of India."

† Zedler's "Universal Lexicon," Leipsic, 1451. *Vid.* Prioli.

Harper's Family Library—"Sketches of Venetian History" (pub. 1843), Vol. II., p. 200:

"Together with the cultivation of the arts during this unwonted period of tranquillity, the Venetians frequently indulged their love of public spectacles and brilliant pageants. One of these exhibitions, on the marriage of Zilia Dandoli with the Doge Lorenzo Priuli, is described at much length by Sansovino, and it presents a singular mixture of splendor and rudeness. After enumerating the triumphal arches and tapestried streets through which the bride was conducted from her father's palace, to grace a regatta with her presence, we are told that on her subsequent arrival at St. Mark's there were shot off so many and so loud volleys of artillery from the neighboring *rivi*, 'that it was a sound horrible to the ear.' The great portals of the cathedral were partially shut, in order that the populace, by entering more slowly, might escape being trampled to death and suffocated; yet their pressure was so excessive when once admitted, and their clamor so deafening, that after the princess had taken the customary oaths at the high altar, not a syllable of a speech addressed to her by a *cavaliere* of the Doge could be understood. On quitting the church, and proceeding to the ducal palace, she found the state apartments occupied by the trades and guilds of the city, each of which invited the bride to partake of a rich collation provided at the expense and by the order of the Doge; and each in turn received a similar answer of thanks, and a similar excuse, both on account of fatigue and of the necessity of passing on to the next company. The evening concluded with a protracted display of fireworks in the palace court, followed by a supper and a ball, which detained the guests till dawn; and like festivities were continued during three successive days, one of which was dedicated to the gentle pastime of bull-baiting, for the satisfaction of the newly married princess and her attendant ladies. This extraordinary rejoicing seems to have been elicited by the rarity of a dogaressa, for, strange as it may appear, a hundred years had passed since any prince had shared his dignity with a consort. Zilia on her death received scarcely less distinguished honors than on her

nuptials; her body, habited in the regalia, lay during three days in magnificent state, and then was followed to the tomb by the reigning Doge and all the public functionaries."

Lorenzo Priuli * died in 1559, and was succeeded by his brother Jerome, who filled the office of Doge for eight years, and was followed by his brother-in-law, Peter Loredano, whose family furnished other Doges, besides admirals, ecclesiastics, and many civil public functionaries.

A nephew of the Doge Lorenzo, bearing his name, came into prominence soon after the death of his uncle, going as ambassador to France in 1565 and again in 1582, having in the meantime represented the republic at the courts of Francis of Florence, of Philip II. of Spain, and of Pope Gregory XIII.

He became Patriarch of Venice in 1591, and received the cardinal's hat from Clement VIII. in 1596.

In Ranke's "History of the Popes" the despatches of this eminent diplomatist are often quoted, as are also those of Peter Priuli, ambassador to France in 1608, and of Francis Priuli, ambassador to Spain the same year; citations are also made from Jerome Priuli's "Chronicles of Venice."

Ranke refers at some length to Louis Priuli, who entertained in 1540 many men of note at his villa, Treville, not far from Treviso: "His was one of those pure and finished Venetian characters," says Ranke, "such as we now and then encounter even in the present day, full of calm susceptibility for true and noble sentiments and for disinterested friendship. His guests chiefly occupied themselves with spiritual studies and conversations" (Vol. I., p. 106).

This Louis Priuli had a part in the notable but fruitless negotiations at Ratisbon in 1541, between the supporters of Luther and those of the papacy, which the Bishop of Aquila called "a holy colloquy, sure to bring about a reconciliation of Christendom." Priuli was sent to Rome with the articles of the proposed agreement, and found it no easy task to explain,

---

* A fine painting by Tintoretto, representing the investiture of Lorenzo Priuli as Doge of Venice, may be seen in the ducal palace.

or even to secure a hearing for what was said on the subject of "justification."

Ranke's praise of Louis Priuli as a man capable of "disinterested friendship" is justified by the narrative to be found in Moreri's "Biographical Dictionary," which speaks of him as the devoted friend for twenty-six years of Reginald Pole.

Pole, it will be remembered, was that ecclesiastical cousin of Henry VIII. to whom he first turned for assistance at the beginning of his career of successive divorces, and who retreated from England to the continent, disgusted with his royal cousin's enormities. He incurred Henry's wrath after the marriage to Anne Boleyn, by comparing him to Nebuchadnezzar, was deprived of his pension and preferments, and put under the ban of an act of attainder.

Louis Priuli had become his intimate friend before this, while he was living in Venice; and after Paul III. gave Pole the cardinal's hat, sending him as nuncio to France and Flanders, Priuli left country and friends to be with him.

Later he declined the sacred purple offered him by Julius III., for the sole reason that he could not resolve to leave his dear friend. He followed him to his native country when he returned, after Henry's death, to become Primate of England, and remained with him till the end of his life, in 1558.

That the English prelate returned the affection of his Venetian lover is shown by his leaving him his entire fortune. And Priuli proved his disinterestedness by keeping nothing save a crystal crucifix the cardinal always wore at his neck. He gave one-half of Pole's property to the poor, and divided the rest among his relatives.

Running through the fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, and far into the eighteenth centuries, the Priuli family furnished a succession of men eminent for their ability in public and private life, many of whom cannot be named, even, in this narrative.

Aloysius Priuli published four volumes of poetry in 1533; John Priuli, Capellmeister of the Emperor Ferdinand II. of Austria, in 1624, attained distinction as a musical composer, publishing an oratorio in Venice in 1618, and an opera in 1625.

A long line of Priulis figure as Councillors of St. Mark, from 1453 to 1739, and the record of four or five bishops, with three cardinals, proves that the family was recognized in the church as in the state. Besides the two Doges already named, the family was drawn upon for a third in 1618, and it was this Antonio Priuli who was unwarrantably claimed as a grandfather by Elisha Prioleau of Charleston.

How this error came about will be easily explained by the romantic story of that member of the family to whom, more than to any other of his name in Italy, the interest of descendants of Huguenots will naturally go out.

At the middle of the sixteenth century Pierre Lauredano, brother-in-law of Jerome Priuli, and his immediate successor in the ducal office, was sent, as has already been mentioned, by the republic as its ambassador at the court of Henry II. of France, a prince whose reign furnishes one of the most dramatic periods in French history.

This ruler, under the guidance and instigation of *his* rulers, Diana of Poitiers, the elder Montmorency, and Henry of Guise, Cardinal of Lorraine, ordered persecutions of the so-called heretics, with the knowledge of which he might quiet his conscience when he thought of his vices, and with the fame of which he might aspire to secure from the Pope a continuance of the title of "Very Christian King," accorded by the Holy Father to some of his predecessors.

Never was a season of persecution more bitter than that which affords such incidents as the burning, before the eyes of the king, of the despised tailor from the Rue St. Antoine, who dared to retort upon His Majesty's Diana, when she turned the shafts of her wit upon his religion: "Madam, let it suffice you to have infected France, without desiring to mingle your poison and filth with so holy and sacred a thing as the true religion of Jesus Christ;" or that of the arrest, before they had even opened their mouths for the new faith, of the "five scholars of Lausanne," young theological students returning to France fresh from the teachings of Calvin and Beza; and their final execution at the stake, whence they preached their first and last sermons with literal tongues of fire, rousing and

inspiring their countrymen, by this single utterance, as a lifetime of ordinary pulpit eloquence would have failed to do.

It will be remembered that it was during the reign of Henry II. that, in spite of the persecutions they encountered, the Huguenots effected the organization of the Protestant Church of France, at the first National Synod held in Paris in May, 1559, only two months before the death of the king.

It was during the first year of Henry II.'s reign that Pierre Lauredano came as ambassador to France, bringing in his suite his nephew, Antonio Priuli, a youth of twenty, destined to found in France a family nobler than that from which he sprang in Italy. What is known of the career of this young man makes it easy to believe that his character was like that of his kinsman Louis, "full of calm susceptibility for true and noble sentiments, and for disinterested friendship."

For it is recorded of him that, esteeming lightly the young dames of the court, with whom he mingled freely, he speedily fixed his affections on a Huguenot maiden of noble family, from the province of Saintonge, whose father was sojourning in Paris.

So deep was this attachment that young Priuli soon persuaded his uncle to sanction a marriage, though this was in direct violation of the laws of his country.

Trusting that even the grave senate of the republic would, like all the world, "love a lover," and pardon his offence, Antonio hastened with his beautiful bride to Venice, hoping to secure a reversal of the decrees of centuries, in his favor. But the old magnates of St. Mark had forgotten the days of their youth.

They were unyielding in their loyalty to the law which forbade a noble of Venice to wed a foreigner, and would have declared the marriage void had not the signature of Lauredano, the ambassador, been attached to the contract.

The family of young Priuli received him and his bride very coldly, and the senate decreed that he and his posterity should be debarred from holding office.

This, to a Venetian nobleman, was a social degradation which made life in Venice intolerable, and it was undoubtedly

expected that under the pressure of this penalty Antonio would renounce his marriage. But his decision was soon made in quite another direction, and he proved the sincerity of his love for the Huguenot maiden by making her people his people, her country his country, her faith his faith.

For love's sake he gave up rank, wealth, country, the certainty of preferment, in short, everything that to most men made life worth living in those days, and turned his face to a foreign land, to cast in his lot with a people who lived in daily dread of the rack, the prison, and the stake.

He was indeed worthy to be the sire of the race of saints and heroes which sprang from his loins.

The exiled Priuli made his home among the relatives of his wife in the province of Saintonge, at the small town of St. Jean d'Angely, where a few years later he bore his part in the heroic defence of the place against a siege conducted in person by Catherine de' Medici and Charles IX.

For seven weeks, behind feeble fortifications, the garrison, seconded with unwearying energy by the inhabitants, including even the women and children, held at bay the entire army of the victors of Moncontour, losing less than two hundred men, as against more than six thousand of the besiegers who died under the walls.

In spite of the perils and distresses of the times the family of Priuli, or Prioleau, as it came to be called, flourished in Saintonge.

Many children were born to Antonio, and wealth must have come to the family in some way, for it is said of a grandson, Julian, that "he ruined himself by his four marriages, and the expenses he was at in the war, being the first officer of the Regiment de la Force.* Julian Priuli, who was the eldest son of Antonio's eldest son Mark, is alluded to in the "Biographie Generale" of Firmin-Didot frères, Paris, 1862, as having embraced the doctrines of Calvin, and impoverished himself in the wars for his religion.

---

* "Dictionary Historical and Critical" of Mr. Peter Bayle, 1696. *Vid.* Benjamin Priolo.

A son of Julian by his fourth wife was Benjamin, born at St. Jean d'Angely in 1602, who wrote his name Priolo, and whose career was romantic and brilliant.

In writing of the Prioleaus in France, Haag, in his "La France Protestante," says:

"The family seems to have originated in Saussignac. It was numerous, according to an old register of baptisms celebrated in the Reformed Church of that town, which we have had in our hands. Nothing in this register would lead one to suppose that the family held high rank among the *bourgeoisie*, still less that it enjoyed at this time the privileges of the nobility. There is no ground for claiming relationship between our Prioleaus and Benjamin Priolo, who pretended to be a great-grandson of a Doge of Venice."

De Roque, in his "Recherches de la Noblesse," Montauban, 1616, says that the Prioleaus did not come originally from Venice, as is claimed by a great number of records, in the reign of Henry III.

And *Le Soberiena* says that Benjamin Priolo was a natural son of a nobleman of Venice.

But Moreri, in his "Universal Dictionary," laughs at this idea, and says that Venice would be the last country in the world to recognize a natural son.

And Peter Bayle, who, in his "Dictionary Historical and Critical," has an extended notice of Benjamin Priolo, published within thirty years after his death, says he has no doubt, after extended research, as to the identity of the family.

Zedler, in his "Universal Lexicon," published in 1742, holds the same view. The family was naturalized in France under Charles IX. as "foreign nobility."

Benjamin Priolo, though born a Huguenot, was not an ardent religionist; indeed, he abjured the Reformed faith late in life and entered the Romish Church. He was evidently a man of great personal ambition, but was pure in his life, held to lofty principles, and gave distinguished services to his country and his time.

At a very early age he showed an unusual fondness for study, often spending whole days and nights in reading with-

out interruption. His parents died when he was fifteen, leaving him in limited circumstances.

These misfortunes seemed only to strengthen his determination to become a learned man, and he pursued his studies first at Orthez, then at Montauban, and afterwards at Leyden, where he attended the lectures of Heinsius, Professor of Politics and History, and those of Vossius, Professor of Rhetoric and Eloquence. In Leyden, where he remained two years, he read all the Greek and Latin poets and historians.

He made a special journey to Paris for the purpose of consulting the eminent Hugo Grotius, who had then (1621) just escaped from his two years' imprisonment in the Castle of Löwenstein, through the well-known stratagem of his wife, who boxed him up and had him carried out as a package of books.

The young man completed his studies at Padua, whither he was attracted by the eminent teachers of philosophy, Cremonius and Licerus. In 1608, when he was quite a child, the family, then become prosperous and influential in France, were urged to return to Venice by the Doge, Leonardo Donati. These overtures were declined, but it was not forgotten in the family that it was of noble Venetian origin.

Benjamin acted on this knowledge, and soon after the completion of his studies made a journey to Venice, where he was kindly received by the government. But he was not then admitted to the prerogatives of the family,—his descent from a foreign marriage still constituting an obstacle to such recognition.

In 1660, however, his claims were fully allowed, and a patent was issued, under the seal of the republic, declaring Benjamin Priolo to be a noble Venetian knight.

This patent was accompanied by a gold chain and medal worth three hundred pistoles. The arms of the Priuli were blazoned and added to the seal, with the inscription, *Non data, non concessa, sed adnata, Senatus decreta.* Mr. Priolo received at the same time a congratulatory letter from Lorenzo Priuli. Proveditor of the Sea, who was then the head of the family.

Returning from his first trip to Venice, Priolo attached

himself to the Duke of Rohan, whose brother Benjamin, Duke of Soubise, the bold but unsuccessful defender of St. Jean d'Angely at its second siege, was his godfather. It was this De Rohan who was prominent in the expedition from England for the relief of La Rochelle, and who, after the surrender of that stronghold, made himself a voluntary exile, died in England, and was buried in Westminster Abbey.

In the service of the more distinguished Henry de Rohan, Benjamin Priolo proved himself an able diplomatist and a brave soldier.

He was sent twice to Spain to conduct important negotiations, and was conspicuous for his bravery in several of the duke's campaigns, serving both in the cavalry and in the infantry. At the death of the duke in 1638, from wounds received in the battle of Rheinfeld, Priolo came with his body to Geneva, and was instrumental in securing its burial in the cathedral, where later the court of France caused a monument and statue to be erected.

Priolo then took up his residence near Geneva, having married Elizabeth Michaeli, descended from the Duke of Lucca and a noble Venetian.

He was called out of his retirement by the Duke of Longueville, who had been made Plenipotentiary of France for the negotiations at Münster. Priolo rendered important services in this notable diplomatic transaction, which, among other things, secured to France the province of Alsace, that bone of contention, struggles for the possession of which have so often convulsed Europe.

So highly did the Duke of Longueville esteem Priolo's services at Münster that he secured him a pension of 1,200 pounds, and made him a present of 1,200 crowns.

Determining to remove his home to Paris, he spent six months at Lyons, where, through the influence of Cardinal Barberini, he and his family were led to abjure the Protestant faith.

In Paris misfortunes befell him. He at first had the favor of the queen-mother and Cardinal Mazarin, but he incurred their ill-will by supporting Condé in the troubles of the Fronde,

and was compelled to leave France, being declared a rebel by act of parliament, and his estates confiscated.

He retired to Flanders, where, to divert the melancholy brought about by his persecutions, he set about writing a history of France.

Later he seems to have regained the good-will of Mazarin, or, possibly, it was that he only profited by the compunctions of conscience of the prelate-prince, for it appears that the cardinal, who died in 1661, left Priolo a pension of 1,500 pounds, with other valuable property.

A year after the death of Mazarin Priolo gained the friendship of Louis XIV., and published the substance of his history in one volume, wishing to see, before bringing out the entire work, how the chief persons of the court would regard the manner of his writing, which was quite free from the usual restraint of courtiers, although less free in this abridgment than in the complete history.

Some of the ministers thought too great liberties were taken even in the preliminary volume, and declared they would oppose the publication of the work. But Priolo secured the permission of the king to print his book as he had written it. Accordingly it was published in 1665, at Charleville, in seven quarto volumes, and was dedicated to the Doge and Senate of Venice. Several editions were printed, notably one in 1669, at Utrecht, from the famous press of Elzevir, and Bayle, in commenting on the book, says he is sure "that if it had been written in French with the same sprightliness and strength which appear in the Latin, it would have been printed above ten times."

Priolo was called into the diplomatic service again in 1667, being then directed to proceed to Venice on a secret mission. But he did not live to perform this duty. Tarrying on his journey at Lyons, he died of apoplexy in the archbishop's palace, and was buried in the Church of St. John.

Priolo's two sons attained some prominence in the civil and military service of France.

Two of his daughters were in attendance upon the court.

The other three became nuns; one of these was distin-

guished as the founder and prioress of the royal Monastery of Chaillot.

The intimacy begun between the families of Priolo and that of the great Prince Condé, in 1652, was continued through several generations, and in 1748 the head of the Condé family stood as godfather to a great-grandson of Benjamin Priolo.

On the last page of Priolo's "History of France" the titles of other works are given which seem never to have been published. One of them is a philosophical treatise, another astronomical. There are also lives of Cremonius, his old preceptor at Padua, and of Henry, Duke of Rohan, an auto biography, a book of maxims, and extended criticisms of Greek and Roman literature.

Bayle appears to have had access to these manuscripts, and speaks highly of their value. He says that Priolo set up an uncompromising standard of chaste living and absolute truth in all human intercourse, which is remarkable, considering the manners of the times in which he lived.

"He abhorred lying to such a degree," says Bayle, "that he could not hear of it without falling into a passion; and he exhorted his children above all things to avoid that fault and live a pious life. 'Every Christian,' said he, 'ought to hate lying; and a gentleman ought to be free from it, tho' he be not a Christian.' He mortally hated those who laughed at the Scriptures."

From Priolo's comments on the classical writers a quotation or two will be of interest.

"I take Livy," he says, "to have been the noblest author that the Roman Empire ever produced. He represented the very spirit and words of persons in so lively a manner that you would think he is acting and speaking the same things; and this he does, not in a forced and labored, but an easy and clear, and (what gives me pain) an inimitable style."

Replying to critics who had accused him of plagiarism, and condemned his style, he says:

"I profess myself to be a thief of singular rapacity; I have pitched hands, and lay hold on everything. A bold plunderer

of Tacitus and others; I transfer his indigested pages into my own work. Unless you animate a dead language with passages of the ancients, what is to be expected but a languid and lifeless performance.

"My style, forsooth, is broken, unequal, and (to use the words of the same pretender to criticism) no style at all. Know, thou coxcomb, whoever thou art, that I have had an intimate knowledge of the ancients from my childhood; that I read them at court and in the camp; that they now present themselves to me uncalled."

Benjamin Priolo, though less consistent than most of his family in matters of mere religion, shows himself to have been a man of lofty character, capable of making great sacrifices for his friends, and for the cause he believed to be right.

But we are now to meet with those whose claim for our regard stands on higher ground.

To be a Huguenot pastor in the seventeenth century was to take one's life literally in one's hand, and to live from day to day in constant readiness for the severest possible punishments and persecutions.

Among the Prioleaus of France five can be named who served their fellow-men in this self-denying office, their service covering more than a century of continuous labor and influence, and it is known that several others were ministers, whose names the writer has not been able to discover.

The first of this honorable line was Antonio, a grandson of the exile. He studied theology at Geneva and was pastor at Tonnay-Boutonne in 1603. He wrote a book on the Canon of the Mass which his brethren forbade him to publish.

An illustration of the embarrassments more than once encountered by the writer in his researches as to the Priuli family should be noted in this connection. In a manuscript belonging to a descendant of the Prioleaus, Mr. Daniel Ravenel, of Charleston, kindly placed at the disposal of the writer by him, through Rev. Dr. C. S. Vedder, now pastor of the Huguenot Church in Charleston, it is stated on the authority of the records of the Venerable Association of Pastors of Geneva, for the years 1637 and 1638, that this Antonio Prioleau

was born in Venice and brought up in France, where he embraced the Reformed religion, and gave his name a French termination to avoid the jokes passed upon it as pronounced in French, *Pris-au-lit*, from the Italian spelling *Pri-o-li*. It is said, moreover, that this Prioleau was the chaplain of the Duke of Rohan at the time of his death, in 1638, evidently a confusion of Antonio with Benjamin, already alluded to.

How this singular series of misstatements came to be recorded as facts the writer has no means of discovering, but he is satisfied beyond dispute that they are without foundation.

According to manuscripts of Crottet, quoted by General W. G. de Saussure, of Charleston, and also furnished the writer by Dr. Vedder, the pastor of Tonnay-Boutonne left one son, "noble Elisha Prioleau, Seigneur de la Viennerie," who was pastor at Jonzac for some years prior to 1637, and later at Niort, where he died in 1650.

The records show that he took a prominent part in the affairs of the Reformed Church. In Quick's "Synodicon" he is alluded to as representing the Colloquy or Presbytery of Saintonge in the Synod of Castres in 1626, and again in the Synod of Alanan in 1637.

Elisha Prioleau gained his title of *Seigneur de la Viennerie* through his wife, who was the eldest daughter of Pastor St. Jean, of St. Jean d'Angely.

This pastor owned a considerable estate in the province of Saintonge, from which he derived his title. Leaving no sons, his estate, with the title, descended to his son-in-law, Elisha Prioleau. It is easy to see how this appellation, taken in connection with the name of his father, Antonio, led some of his descendants to claim the Doge Antonio as their ancestor.

Elisha Prioleau gave two sons to the ministry he had so much adorned, Elisha, who was pastor at Exoudun-Poitou from 1649 to 1663, and Samuel, the more eminent pastor at Pons from 1650 to 1683.

The minister at Exoudun-Poitou was the father of Margaret Prioleau, who married Joshua Gallaudet, and whose son,

Dr. Peter Elisha Gallaudet, the first of his name in America, was one of the founders of New Rochelle, N. Y.

Samuel Prioleau's long pastorate at Pons was not continuous, as would appear from Crottet's history, but was interrupted about the year 1660 by a call to be pastor of La Rochelle. He was, however, soon recalled to Pons, where he defended the faith with almost superhuman courage during the dark days of trial which attended the later years of his life. This was the period when Louis XIV. was being pressed by the Jesuits and clergy to rob the Reformed churches of the rights conceded by the Edict of Nantes.* One after another its provisions were infringed, till the Protestants were deprived of all means of protecting or exercising their ecclesiastical rights. Under these circumstances Elias Merlat, † pastor at Saintes, made overtures for the assembling of a Synod at Pons, to concert means for removing the obstacles interposed to the exercise of the Reformed worship. It met in June, 1667, and Samuel Prioleau filled the office of Moderator.

Meanwhile their enemies attempted to deprive the pastors and their worship of all symbols of outward dignity. The title of pastors was denied them, and they were called simply ministers of the pretended or self-styled Reformed religion. They were prohibited from wearing their clerical robes, or to appear in long habits outside the houses of worship.

The use of bells was forbidden in garrisoned towns. They were not allowed to sing psalms in public, or at the execution of criminals, or on days of public rejoicing. Funerals could only take place at the break of day or in the early night, and this without any address or exhortation from the pastor. The national and provincial Synods were required to forbid pastors from preaching, except in the places of their residence, cutting

---

* Crottet's "Histoire," etc.

† The wife of Samuel Prioleau was Jeanne Merlat, a daughter of his friend, the pastor at Saintes. The latter published in 1679 a book in answer to one by the celebrated Armand, entitled "The Subversion of the Morals of Jesus Christ by the Doctrines of the Calvinists touching Justification." Merlat was placed under perpetual interdict, fined 3,000 pounds, and his book condemned to be torn and burned in front of the church by the common hangman.

off thus, from small congregations, the exercise of public worship.

Samuel Prioleau remonstrated boldly in his pulpit against these arbitrary and burdensome restrictions. His words were taken down and preserved with care.

Father Mayac, Director of the Recollets, of the order of St. Francis, brought serious but unfounded charges against Pastor Prioleau.

In spite of strenuous efforts on the part of the most honorable and prominent citizens of Pons to secure justice to the persecuted minister, he was condemned, after an imprisonment of a year, to pay a fine of 600 pounds, 500 of which went to the Franciscans for the construction of their convent, on condition that they should pray on St. Paul's Day and St. Peter's Day for the exaltation of the Holy Church and the Holy Father, the Pope, and should invoke the Lord for the extirpation of heresy.

The latter years of Samuel Prioleau's ministry were full of excitement and distress.

He had for a short period in 1678 the assistance of his son Elias, then just returned from his theological studies at Geneva, who preached for him on many occasions. But his persecutors would not long allow him this comfort, and Elias was compelled to seek a permanent settlement elsewhere. He was soon settled as joint pastor at La Mothe-saint Héraye, where he encountered at the beginning of his ministry the same troubles which were bowing his aged father's head with grief.

Samuel Prioleau died in February, 1683, and his son Elias was almost immediately called to be his successor at Pons.

Crottet, in his "History of the Church at Pons," speaks thus of this intrepid young man:

"With a true devotedness he entered upon the work confided to him. Many of his colleagues of the neighboring churches had been torn from their people under various pretences. In spite of this he did not fear to place himself at the head of a church environed with so many dangers. He prudently strove with the elders of the Consistory to conform to the royal orders. Proper measures were taken to send the

titles of the church to Paris, and to deposit them with the Marquis de Chateauneuf, that they might be remitted to the Council of State. They caused, meanwhile, to be read in church during many consecutive Sabbaths the act of the last Synod, which excluded from the Supper those whom fear or worldly interests had induced to abjure the evangelical worship. They distributed tokens to the communicants (pieces of block-tin the size of a *sou*, with the inscription, 'Fear not, little flock,'), which the holders were obliged to present on approaching the communion table. On days of communion seven or eight hundred persons partook of the sacrament, church dues were promptly paid, and discipline strictly administered.

"But difficulties thickened around this devoted church and minister. All other churches in that neighborhood had already been annihilated. In February, 1684, Du Vigier, Councillor of the Parliament of Bordeaux, charged to take cognizance of the infractions of the edicts and declarations of the king in the department of Saintonge, repaired to Pons, and ordered all the papers which the Consistory might possess to be delivered to him. He associated with himself two monks of the Recollets (of St. Francis) as denunciators, witnesses, parties, registrars, or assessors. One, La Roussie, set himself to making extracts from all the sermons of Prioleau that he could hear of or procure, and put them into the hands of the Deputy Commissary after he had spitefully distorted them. The other was Augustin Mayac, who had persecuted his father a few years before, and who, with more ingenuity and effrontery than success, formulated sixteen charges against the young minister.

"These accusations were mainly of irregularities of an innocent sort, and Prioleau's pursuers, having failed to convict him of any wrong, turned their shafts of enmity upon his people."

It is unnecessary to relate the many cruelties and indignities that were resorted to in the hope of breaking the spirit of young Prioleau and his people.

These persecutions were kept up with unrelaxing vigor until the fatal 22d of October, 1685, when the last hope of the

Protestants of France was destroyed by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

It will be remembered that this act ordained the demolition of all the Reformed churches in the realm; the cessation of Protestant worship; that the ministers should leave the kingdom in fifteen days; and that parents should present their children for baptism to the priests under the penalty of a fine of 500 pounds.

News of these terrible orders reached the people of Pons in November. The greater part, through fear of a merciless continuance of the persecutions to which they had been so long subjected, signed a formula of abjuration. Those who persisted saw their children conducted to the mass, their daughters shut up in the convents of Pons and Saintes, and their sons educated by Jesuits. Others made preparations to quit a country where they could no longer serve God in accordance with the dictates of their consciences.

Prioleau could not bring himself to leave at once the flock that was so dear to him. He braved the existing dangers and organized secret assemblies.

The day of final destruction came to this heroic church on the 15th of April, 1686, when their house of worship was battered down.

While their enemies were destroying the temple, sacred to them by hallowed associations, a remnant of the people were assembled elsewhere to listen, amid their sobs and tears, to their loved pastor's last discourse.

This was from Matthew: chapter x., verses 36, 37, 38, 39:

"A man's foes shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it; and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."

The historian Crottet, who was Prioleau's successor as pastor of the restored church at Pons, as late as 1842, closes his graphic sketch of his predecessor as follows:

"From this moment we are entirely ignorant as to the lot

of this faithful minister. Perhaps he was a victim of his zeal and devotion, and ended his days in the galleys of Rochefort; or, more likely, seeing that his presence was a continual danger to those who gave him asylum, he decided to emigrate to a foreign country. However this may have been, while he was at Pons he never failed to exhibit the qualities and virtues of a veritable servant of God."

Had the records which existed at the time of the writing of his history been accessible to Crottet, he would have found that his last conjecture was correct, and, no doubt, would have closed his narrative with an account of Elias Prioleau's important career in America.

It does not appear just how or when Prioleau and a goodly company of his people left France and reached America, but it is well known that they settled in Charleston, South Carolina, within eighteen months after the destruction of their loved home church.

Prioleau and his family tarried long enough in England to be naturalized there on the 15th of April, 1687, the anniversary of the day his church at Pons was destroyed.

A correspondence between Mr. Crottet and Daniel Ravenel, Esq., a descendant of Elias Prioleau, now living in Charleston, satisfied the former that the Huguenot Church of Charleston was the immediate successor of the church at Pons, and young Prioleau is therefore beyond question to be considered the founder of this early and now venerable American church.

Prioleau had associated with him in the pastorate Florent Philippe Trouillart, who had been minister in France of the churches at Calais and at Guisnes.

There is ample evidence, aside from his record in his native country, that Elias Prioleau was a man of unusual talent.

Weiss, in his "History of French Protestant Refugees," says of him, Vol. I., p. 377:

"The first pastor of the French church of Charleston was not only an eloquent preacher, but also a writer of a certain merit. His descendants possess manuscript copies of his works, which, in the opinion of a distinguished writer on law,

testify great purity of doctrine and at the same time eloquence of style and vigor of mind."

The ministry of this remarkable man in South Carolina was comparatively short. He suffered from the great change in climate, and died when about forty years of age, in 1699.

He received no salary in Charleston, having brought property enough with him from France to enable him to purchase a plantation on the Medway (now Black) River, where he died, and where his remains were buried.

That he ministered to more than one congregation is shown by legacies left in his will to the "two parishes which I serve with equal assiduity."

He never assumed his grandfather's title of *Seigneur de la Viennerie*, which his father also bore, but that he had a share in that estate is suggested by a claim in his will which devises "the third part of the patrimony which I ought to have in Saintonge."

It would extend this paper beyond all reasonable limits to attempt to relate the history of the noble family of Prioleau in America. Possibly this may be undertaken in the future.

Such a narrative would show that great numbers of those in whose veins the blood of the Priulis has flowed have held honored places in public and private life. The family has been connected by the closest of ties with the Hookers, the Howards, the Hopkinses, the Fessendens, the Robinsons, the Denisons, the Aldens, the Trumbulls, and the Fowlers of New England; with the Olivers, the Van Deusens, the Edgars, the Godwins, the Fields, the Mitchells, the Ambroses, the Badeaus, the Scribners, and the Stocktons of the Middle States: and with the Ravenels, the Chisholms, the Edmondstons, the Giguillots, the Dawsons, the Ropers, the Gaillards, the Balls, the Hunters, the Erwins, and the Hardees of the South.

But it is not alone under other names that the old Hungarian-Venetian race has been perpetuated to these later times.

In England, and in our own States of Georgia and South Carolina, many of the Prioleau name are now living, among whom are to be found not a few distinguished in the army, in the ministry, at the bar, in the medical profession, as archi-

tects, and as business men. Two of the name, residing at Charleston, are rejoicing in the ripe age of ninety years, having possibly inherited their longevity, by a freak of atavism, from the old Venetian Doge who stormed the walls of Constantinople at ninety-two.

Mr. President and Members of the Huguenot Society, it is not necessary in this presence to adorn a chapter of Huguenot history by "pointing a moral." But as I close this brief narrative of a family, members of which, through many centuries, have stood for the things that are honest, just, pure, lovely, and of good report in this world, I find myself moved with that feeling which Dr. Bushnell once described as the "tide-swing of a great historic consciousness." I am in sympathy with the grand Duke of Somerset who "pitied Adam because he had no ancestors."

It is no small privilege that the members of the Huguenot Society enjoy, of materializing, as it were, and making a part of their present experience the noble deeds of their heroic and sainted kindred. And we may congratulate ourselves that the inspirations of our association lead us, from time to time, to draw out and bring to life from the storehouses of the buried past such immortal treasures as the character of Louis Priuli, who proved, by his life-long fealty to his English brother-in-Christ, that he was capable of the rare virtue of disinterested friendship; or as that of Antonio, who exiled himself from home and country, and renounced rank, honors, and wealth for the sake of the noblest and sweetest human object of man's devotion, a true and loving wife; or the character most saintly of all, of the young Elias, who freely placed his life on the altar of his Master, enduring persecution at home until the wrath of his enemies drove him away from his beloved country, and then braved the dangers and hardships of a distant wilderness to plant the banner of the cross in a new world.

It is by association in thought with such spirits as these that we gain strength to rise, in feeling and purpose, above the sordid, self-seeking, and self-indulgent levels on which, in these times of luxury and culture, we are too often content to dwell.

1373